

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. IVES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a further delay, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIXON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Organization, which will meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present, the previously listed Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Monroney
Byrd	Humphrey	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
Gillette	Long	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood

NAYS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Nixon
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Kem	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cain	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Lodge	Thye
Case	McCarran	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Dworschak	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	George	O'Connor
Chavez	Hunt	Taft
Duff	Jenner	Tobey
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Margaret K. Aldrich, ANC, N772113.
Elizabeth R. Perry, ANC, N797300.

To be first lieutenants

Dolores L. Evanson, WMSC, M2810.
Genevieve Lescsak, WMSC, M1125.

To be second lieutenants

Jean C. Altenburger, WAC, L1010260.
Clarissa L. Aping, WAC, L1010279.
Alice M. Barr, WAC, L1010258.
Eva M. Benson, WAC, L1010264.
Frances J. Biddle, WAC, L1010267.
Patricia L. Bouldin, WAC, L1010261.
Barbara J. Brown, WAC, L1010263.
Eva M. Burgess, WAC, L1010255.
Salona Butler, WAC, L1010278.
Helen R. Coplen, WAC, L1010273.
Vivian E. Davis, WAC, L1010276.
Irene S. Ebel, WAC, L1010274.
Irene Evans, WAC, L1010256.
Pola L. Garrett, WAC, L1010238.
Irene S. Gullede, WAC, L1010244.
Ruth Holland, WAC, L1010233.
Janet A. Jawelak, WAC, L1010237.
Shirley J. Justice, WAC, L1010250.

Esther E. Lenox, WAC, L1010270.
Sonja G. Lunoe, WAC, L1010241.
Kitt M. MacMichael, WAC, L1010245.
Phyllis J. Morsman, WAC, L1010259.
Patricia J. Pomeroy, WAC, L1010272.
Dorothy Sherba, WAC, L1010275.
Jacquelyn R. Sollars, WAC, L1010257.
Barbara J. Wardell, WAC, L1010282.
Helen A. Way, WAC, L1010280.
Martha L. Weeks, WAC, L1010269.
Elizabeth A. Whitaker, WAC, L1010281.
Kathleen I. Wilkes, WAC, L1010234.
Sadie E. Yoshizaki, WAC, L1010236.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert M. Griffin, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Alfred E. Montgomery, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the source of our material and spiritual blessings, grant that daily we may be strengthened within in order that we may cope victoriously with all circumstances and conditions without no matter how trying and difficult they may be.

We thank Thee for the priceless principles of our democracy, the authority of conscience, the sovereignty of the people, the equality of all men, and many others which we have received as a glorious heritage.

Make us more eager and able to retain these principles and to safeguard them against all enemies whether within or outside the borders of our beloved country.

May our chosen representatives and all our citizens discharge their duties intelligently and faithfully, fill us with desires to widen the horizons of our sympathy and understanding and deepen within the heart of humanity, the spirit of good will and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. MATTHEW RIDGWAY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighting men we have produced in this age, a man who is filling the biggest single job in our Military Establishment, is still wearing only three stars and he is clearly doing a four-star job. Lt. Gen. Matt Ridgway went to Korea, took a beaten army, regrouped it, reforged its fighting spirit, led it to triumphs which

every American should be and is proud of. Now he is supreme commander of all our vital and far-flung Pacific enterprises. For either he deserves a higher rank, that of full general. I sincerely hope that rank will shortly be forthcoming.

THE JENSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the majority leader is here today as he usually is, at his post.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, accused the gentleman from Minnesota, now addressing the House, of being in a disturbed frame of mind. I believe a reading of the RECORD this morning will show that it was the gentleman from Massachusetts who was disturbed and rightly so. On eight successive roll calls the majority of the Members of the House failed to follow his leadership. In fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts was so disturbed that he repeated twice the allegation that the gentleman from Minnesota had suggested that bureaus inconvenienced by the Jensen amendment should come to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, may I call attention to my statement on page 4745 of yesterday's RECORD, which reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case. We can then put them under that particular class of exemptions, if we so wish. I think we will be very foolish if we do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. Speaker, we will, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested yesterday, let the Members draw their own interpretations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] makes the remarks he does today shows that the statement I made yesterday that he was disturbed is correct. I will quote just what the gentleman said:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island does not bring out the fact that if any of these bureaus do find themselves in difficulty this coming spring, they can come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations affected and state their case.

Well, what are they coming before them for except for a deficiency appropriation? We all know that they can-

not come before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations unless they are seeking a deficiency appropriation. There is only one construction that can be placed upon that language, and that is that they could not come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations unless it was in connection with a deficiency appropriation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal from our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] about the importance of TVA and how the power generated does not cost anybody anything. If you will turn to page 34 of the independent offices appropriation bill, which we will soon consider, in regard to the Tennessee Valley Authority, you will find that this uncalled-for monstrosity costs every taxpayer in the United States plenty to operate. Each year the Federal Government appropriates a few hundreds of millions of dollars for replacement, repair, operation of aircraft, and so forth, for this most inefficient and socialistic agency—the deficit in this bill for this year alone being \$236,139,600, which the Government must borrow in order to keep this spendthrift organization in operation. For efficiency and economy, it should be turned over to private enterprise to operate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we are taking care of ourselves in the Tennessee Valley, but the rest of the people are being shut out from these public power projects, as I showed on yesterday. They are all entitled to the benefits of the cheap electricity produced at these Government dams on our navigable streams.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of peace and harmony, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very important announcement by a little Quaker college in Ohio, Wilmington College, for the promotion of a plan that college education may be put within the reach of all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of informing the gentleman—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi is clearly out of order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded, therefore the gentleman cannot proceed under a reservation of objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

BRITISH DISLOYALTY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Great Britain stopped playing games with us. It is incredible that the British Government would permit the sale of 40,400 tons of rubber to Russia since the beginning of the war. But it is absolutely fantastic that the British would sell 120,000 tons of the same rubber to Communist China. This is a time when soldiers of the British Commonwealth in the forces of the United Nations are fighting Communist Chinese alongside of us.

We have always been loyal to our friends, but loyalty is a two-way street and the British have clearly been disloyal to us. They have been giving lip service to the United Nations' decision to fight in Korea, but they are working both sides of the street. For the sake of British trade in Hong Kong, the Labor Government is playing the shabbiest kind of immoral dishonesty and incredible politics. If anything should bring the Labor Party to defeat, this shocking demonstration of duplicity is it.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks which I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am going to include certain material and data regarding the problem of veterans in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I think the Members will admit that there is a shortage of beds, particularly in the NP and TB hospitals. The Army and Navy and National Defense have requested of the Veterans' Administration beds for men still in service who have NP and TB disabilities. The overcrowding in those hospitals is extremely dangerous. There will be a great many accidents and the men are not getting the proper care due to shortage of personnel.

Also, there must be a military status of the doctors in the veterans' hospitals, otherwise you will have practically no doctors and nurses to take care of the patients, for many already have been drafted for the armed services. It was necessary in World War II to do this.

AID TO INDIA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor simply to warn the membership of this body not to be caught in the trap that the so-called India wheat bill has set for them. This bill is simply a softening-up process. It simply makes way for other countries that are coming for a hand-out. The advocates of a further, or new ECA thought it best to bring this bill up because of the so-called humanitarian element involved. A vote for this bill will be a vote of confidence in Dean Acheson, and it will be committing us to another little ECA that will be known as the Javits plan, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been doing the thinking and the planning for the group interested in bringing into existence this additional little ECA, that will in the total call for approximately \$7,000,000,000.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEN IN UNIFORM

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the shock of my life when I learned that certain railroads are discriminating against our boys in uniform. I quote from a letter I received from the mother of a GI:

Last week my son, a member of the United States Air Force, was coming home on leave before reporting to a port of embarkation base. He was traveling from Chicago to Binghamton. When he and several other members of the Armed Forces started to enter the club car, they were told by the conductor that the car was only for Pullman passengers. Do you know if this is a standard policy of all railroads?

How I wish my son and all other sons of mothers the world over could be turned back from battle zones because they are not Pullman passengers.

Such discrimination is an outrage. A GI should be able to move freely from car to car on any train just like any other citizen. Is this the practice going on all over the country, on our railroads or in other public places? I mean to find out. This form of discrimination against our gallant fighting men had better be stopped before it is too late.

All the more reason why Congress should wake up and pass the Hall free furlough bill now languishing in the hands of a House committee. While railroads discriminate against servicemen who are lucky enough to dig up the money to travel second class, thousands of GIs now dog the dusty, dreary highways of our Nation on their long journeys home during furlough.

I might add, the boys tell me it is increasingly difficult for them to thumb and bum their way home. Does not our

country's uniform mean as much to the civilian as it did before? Let us stop this discrimination against our servicemen. If Dean Acheson can ride in a limousine, if the General Staff members ride in Cadillacs and Lincolns, if our generals in the East ride in rickshaws carried by Chinese coolies, why draw the line on our GIs? Let us approve the Hall furlough bill, issue free passes to soldiers who want to visit their homes and forget there was anything like barring men in uniform from club cars or anywhere else in the good old United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Anderson, Calif.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Bramblett	Havener	Passman
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Buckley	Hébert	Powell
Burton	Hinshaw	Price
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Rains
Case	Irving	Redden
Chatham	Jarman	Ribicoff
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Rivers
Cooley	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Shafer
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Klein	Vail
Dingell	Mansfield	Vinson
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Fallon	Morrison	Whitaker
Gillette	Moulder	Widnall
Gore	Murdock	Woodruff
Gossett	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 401)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vermont, for agricultural purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as

follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vermont, and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer."

"The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) relating to the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted an amendment in lieu thereof. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The provisions of the conference substitute are the same as the provisions adopted by the House, except as explained below:

The measure as it passed the House would have required the deed of conveyance to contain a provision reserving any minerals that might be found to exist, including the right to enter, remove, and extract same, and a provision which would cause the title to the lands to revert to the United States if the property was put to any use other than for the benefit of agriculture.

These provisions have been eliminated in the conference substitute. The conference substitute, however, provides that the real and personal property and research records are to be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture, for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of the transfer. This language will give the Secretary of Agriculture somewhat broader authority and will provide greater flexibility in the negotiations that must be conducted between the Secretary of

Agriculture and officials of the Vermont Agricultural College in connection with the transfer of the properties. It is the belief of the committee that the language of the conference substitute is ample to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the intent of the Congress and to protect fully the interests of the United States.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question or the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 220) providing for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 3880, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later of course, as usual, I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from my State [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I am presenting this rule, House Resolution 220. Personally, I am opposed to this rule which provides for the waiver of points of order against legislation which has been inserted in this appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations. This rule is unnecessary as far as consideration of the bill itself is concerned. The committee has already agreed on 4 hours of general debate. This resolution, if adopted, will protect those sections which materially alter general legislation already adopted by the Congress which, under the rules of this House, are the direct responsibility of several of the important standing committees of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this rule waive points of order against amendments?

Mr. SABATH. It waives points of order on the 12 or 14 items of general legislation that are in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I mean amendments offered from the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can answer that question; the answer is "No."

Mr. SABATH. Thirty years ago, as some of you will recall, the legislative committees also had the power to appropriate. This power was taken away from them and made the sole jurisdiction of the great Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations comes in and insists on usurping the prerogatives of legislative committees.

The tendency in recent years has been to increase the amount of general legislation in appropriation bills. If this door continues to be widened we can say goodbye to the legislative committees and turn over all legislation to the Committee on Appropriations. This is very bad practice. I have always opposed it. As an old Member, one who has been here for many years, who has stood for orderly procedure and tried to protect and defend the rights of the membership, I feel this rule should not be adopted. You Members with years of service on important legislative committees, as well as you younger Members who have assumed responsibilities on these committees, have a vital concern in what transpires here today. By voting to adopt this rule you are abrogating the prestige, the power, the responsibility embodied in the committee on which you serve. I feel certain that if you fully realize the import of this resolution, you will vote "no" and thereby protect your own committee. A vote to defeat the motion on the previous question is only a vote against this usurpation of power by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not a vote against the appropriation bill itself.

Under the pretense of economy or reducing certain appropriations the gentlemen who will speak for the rule will undoubtedly employ their worn-out argument that their motives are in the interest of the taxpayer—that great economies will result from the reduction in certain appropriations—but, unfortunately, this will not be borne out by their votes on the real economy bills which come before this House. Some day I shall call attention to their votes on legislation that will place these gentlemen in a rather embarrassing position. They talk about saving thousands in this measure, but when it comes to legislation that means millions upon millions to their friends in big business they are strangely silent with their economy pleas; they go right down the line for them.

Here are some of the important changes in existing law contained in this appropriation bill which this rule proposes to protect:

On page 24, lines 17 to 19: This provision suspends the advance-planning program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under Public Law 352, which authorizes \$100,000,000 for this program. This proviso limits the total advances for the program from its inception to \$27,000,000. This will seriously cripple the housing program at a time when our defense effort creates a greater demand than ever for housing for defense workers.

Page 25, line 17 through line 7, page 26: The limitations embodied in these paragraphs constitute a change in exist-

ing law. The Housing Act now provides for 135,000 dwelling units each year to 1954. This proviso limits it to 50,000 units in any 1 year.

Page 30, lines 2 to 6: This proviso virtually suspends section 507 of the Housing Act, which provides administrative funds for the National Capital Housing Authority. The committee allowed \$32,800 for maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the act. Present law permits the National Capital Housing Authority to use funds derived from leases, sales, and so forth, under title I for this purpose without limitation.

Page 53, lines 14 to 16: This section amends title III of the National Housing Act by limiting authorizations for administrative expenses for the Federal National Mortgage Association. It cuts the present authorization for administrative purposes by \$540,000.

Page 54, lines 3 to 8: This provision rescinds the authorization of funds for prefabricated housing loans. In effect, it terminates the program authorized by section 102 of the Housing Act of 1948.

Page 55, lines 16 to 19: These lines constitute a change in existing law. They amend the Home Loan Act by inserting a limitation of \$1,664,000 for non-administrative expenses of the Examiner's Division of the Home Loan Bank Board.

Page 57, lines 11 to 14: This section amends the National Housing Act by cutting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to \$22,320,000.

Page 58, lines 13 to 16: These words change section 303 of the Lanham Act, by limiting authorizations for nonadministrative expenses to \$33,000,000.

All of the above involve serious infringement on the responsibilities and duties of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The following two provisions infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Page 45, lines 12 and 18: This limits the number of voyages to be made by subsidized ships flying the American flag, now in operation and/or hereafter contracted for. This is certain to interfere with the proper development and expansion of our American merchant marine; it plays right into the hands of the foreign-registry shipowners, many of whom are American citizens or large corporations.

Page 46, lines 9 to 12: This proviso limits the administrative expenses under our ship-construction program to 5 percent of the total cost of such construction.

There are a number of other provisions of general legislation which I have not touched on which trespass on the jurisdiction of other important legislative committees. Chairman HART, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Chairman SPENCE, of the Banking and Currency Committee; and several other chairmen of legislative committees will undoubtedly give you more detailed information concerning the encroachment upon their respective committees if this rule is adopted.

No single appropriation bill in my memory has endeavored to legislate in

so many instances. Again I repeat, this is entirely contrary to the rules of the House. It is a highly dangerous practice to permit the Committee on Appropriations to legislate in appropriation bills. This rule should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have so many requests for time I shall ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for so much of 30 minutes as he may use.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished chairman has said, this rule waives points of order.

Since I have been on the Rules Committee I venture to say that sometime or other every chairman of a standing committee of this House has come before the Committee on Rules and asked that points of order be waived on certain legislation sponsored by their respective committee.

The reason my friend from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] is opposed to this rule is because the main object is to save the taxpayers some money. To some Members this appears to be a crime. The reason the Appropriations Committee came before the Rules Committee asking for a rule waiving points of order was because they want to save the American taxpayers from one and a half to two billion dollars and that committee knew if it did not make the request for a rule waiving points of order against certain language that constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency would continue to demand 25,000 housing units costing \$9,000 each or a total of \$225,000,000 in order to subsidize low-cost housing at a time when we are probably in the greatest emergency since the War Between the States. It may be even greater. The object of the rule is to defer the building of these subsidized housing units and save a total of \$225,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not the sole purpose of this rule to usurp the functions of the other standing committees of the House by legislating on an appropriation bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say definitely not. The sole object is to save taxpayers' money at a time when we are taxing the people \$55,000,000,000 and, in fact, the Congress is now trying to bleed ten or twelve billion dollars more out of them. So I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of the Appropriations Committee that they have my congratulations for bringing this bill before the House in this manner. Never in all history is it as important to practice economy.

Another group particularly interested in this bill and against waiving points of order is the Maritime Commission. We all know that after the last war our Government, after having paid a million

and a half dollars each for thousands of ships, sold approximately one thousand of these ships to American citizens for about one-third of what they cost; in other words about \$500,000 apiece. The Government feels now that it might be necessary in the present emergency to charter these ships. Those boats which were sold for \$500,000 are now worth approximately two and a half million dollars. The present bill provides that in the event the Government charters these same ships and they are sunk that the Government will pay the owner the amount the Government received for them plus the cost of improvement minus the cost of any depreciation. The owners feel that they should receive the present valuation which is at least four or five times more than they paid the Government. Could anything be more mercenary?

Mr. COX. And plus improvements that are made.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another reason why the Maritime Commission and the ones who have purchased these boats are objecting to this rule waiving points of order is because it has placed a limitation on subsidies. As you know, the Government is subsidizing these boats that cost the Government one and a half million dollars, later sold to American citizens for a half million dollars, for a certain number of voyages. This limits the subsidized voyages to 1,450. These same ship owners desire that all voyages be subsidized although shipping is enjoying one of its greatest prosperities in history with corresponding high profits. This bill provides \$20,000,000 for subsidies. I can understand that because our seamen receive higher wages, because it costs more for their maintenance than the seamen of foreign countries than occasionally in the present emergency that it might be necessary to charter one of the ships for a voyage which would necessarily have to make the run at a loss. The 1,450 subsidized voyages allowed in this bill will take care of these emergencies. The Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, should receive the congratulations of the Members of this House for bringing in a bill designed to save the taxpayers some one and a half billion dollars.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will take the floor in a few minutes and if the Members will listen to what the gentleman has to say they will find complete justification for the action of the Rules Committee in bringing this entire question in here in order that the House might have the opportunity of passing upon the identical question the gentleman has been discussing. In other words, the House is deprived of nothing. These committees that are complaining have been deprived of no rights. Their views may be stressed here with amendments that they have the privilege of offering to the bill. The Rules Committee, in the interest of giving the House an opportunity to effect economy, saw fit to report this rule and they will

find justification for that action in the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will make very shortly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his always sound remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Bills from the Committee on Appropriations are privileged, are they not?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. So if you were to vote down this rule the committee could still call the bill up under the rules of the House; is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule is merely designed to waive points of order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that the will of the majority will decide this issue. When we vote on the previous question the will of the majority is not denied one thing under this rule. If the majority do not want this rule, then, of course, it will be turned down. So, I say the Committee on Rules has not denied the majority membership of this House the right of final determination, because they will have the opportunity of voting the rule up or down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there has not been an important committee of this House that has not been before the Committee on Rules asking for the waiving of points of order on their bills. The Committee on Appropriations came there and in the judgment of the Committee on Rules made a good case, and the committee reported the bill and ordered to give the House the opportunity to now pass upon the important questions that are dealt with in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. And that is all that is dealt with?

Mr. COX. That is all.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion I want to say this: Yesterday the House did a great job in regard to cutting down nondefense expenditures. I have repeatedly stated we should also more carefully scrutinize actual military expenditures. Frankly, I think the House can do an even greater job when we come to reading this bill for amendment and that they can cut down this bill many millions of dollars. I refer especially to the TVA, which I have previously mentioned today. This Congress has a great responsibility. Our chief one is to keep the Nation solvent. In my opinion we cannot do so unless we cut every appropriation to the bone and in addition completely eliminate the scores of governmental agencies now in existence which are not needed and which in no way benefit our people—that is, with the exception of those who are on the taxpayers' payroll.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if permitted to do so, I would like to yield to the gentleman the 5 minutes reserved for me.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia relinquishes his time, then it reverts to the gentleman from Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SABATH. I promised the gentleman from Georgia 5 minutes, and if he desires to do that, it is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for his generosity, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] also.

I do not think there is much room for any heat here. I cannot quibble with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]; we all admire and love him too much to do that. Fundamentally he is right that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to do any legislating, and as a general rule we do not, and the only reason we are here today is purely on account of an emergency, wartime condition, and if that condition did not prevail we would not be here asking you to waive points of order. I hope and pray that you will waive these points of order because this language that we are asking you to waive points of order upon is worth a bare minimum to the taxpayers of this country \$750,000,000 over and above the reductions already made in the bill, and I will give the details to you word for word if you will give me the time. That is a very conservative estimate. It can run much greater than \$750,000,000.

We do not like to be placed in the attitude of encroaching so to speak, on the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Banking and Currency on the housing unit item here. We all respect that great committee and its great chairman. They are fine, patriotic men, and they have done a splendid job.

This is what we have done. You passed a bill in 1949 calling for the construction of 810,000 publicly subsidized low-cost housing units, at an individual cost of about \$9,000. The President reduced it for this year to 75,000 units. All you could start was 75,000 units, on account of the war, the scarcity of material, the scarcity of manpower, and to hold down inflation.

The committee, after thinking it over, decided that figure should be reduced to 50,000 for the fiscal year 1952; for the same reasons: to hold down inflation, and because of the scarcity of materials and manpower, steel bathtubs and cookstoves.

Why does the Committee on Banking and Currency now come here and say we are trespassing on the jurisdiction of their great committee? Because that committee did what? It legislated authority to the Housing Agency to issue notes and other obligations in an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000,000. You did not appropriate it. You do not get to pass on it, and your servant, the Committee on Appropriations, does not get a chance to pass on it. That great legislative committee, whom I admire, wrote into the bill that you go to the

Treasury, not to this House, you go direct to the Treasury for \$1,500,000,000.

Is that all? No. The Banking and Currency Committee also said that when you build these 810,000 units the taxpayers of the United States shall pay each year in the form of a subsidy what amount of money? \$308,000,000. We have no discretion in that appropriation. You do not actually get a chance to decide on the amount and neither does your Committee on Appropriations because the amount required automatically becomes an obligation of the Government. That great committee in effect legislated and appropriated all at one time, and for how long? For 40 years. That is the life of it. It is a debt against the taxpayers of the United States, and they can go into court and obtain a judgment against the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The House passed that bill. The House was "over 21" and knew what it was doing.

Mr. THOMAS. I doubt if the gentleman or most of his committee fully understand it, much as I admire you.

Mr. JAVITS. I am not on that committee, but I understand it, and I think the committee did, and I think the House did.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, we understand it. You dump into the lap of the Committee on Appropriations every year for 40 years a mandate to appropriate \$308,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman think, in all fairness to this House, that it is the duty of this little, humble subcommittee to come in here and point that out to you? All that amounts to for 40 years is approximately \$13,000,000,000 of your money.

Mr. Speaker, there is no room for heat. When you go into the Committee of the Whole, if you adopt this rule, you can amend that language. The only purpose of asking for the rule was that one person could knock out that item on a point of order, without giving the other 434 Members a chance to express themselves. They can knock it out, amend it, or change it in any way they want to. When the war is over you can go back and build every one of these units. We are not taking them away from you; we are just saying they ought to be deferred.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Apropos of the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], while the House was "21" when it passed that authorization, at the same time we did not know then that we had to fight communism all over the world and would need our resources for that.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Let me speak for one moment on the maritime question. We have some language in here that applies only to what price the taxpayers are going to be called

upon in case of an all-out shooting war to pay for ships that the taxpayers have heretofore bought and paid for 100 percent with your money—your money, now, make no mistake about that—and which the Government sold, as far as replacement value is concerned as of today, at 15 cents on the dollar.

In other words this language will not apply until we get in an all-out, shooting war. There are about a thousand ships involved. The Government is forced to take them back, after they have sold them, for 15 cents on the dollar and then they are sunk. This language says, "All you can get is what you paid for that ship, minus depreciation and charter hire that you have received in the meantime."

You talk about not making any millionaires out of the blood, sweat, and tears of these boys who are fighting and dying for \$50 a month. Here is your opportunity. We are just trying to correct a mistake that was made in World War II. Gentlemen, that mistake was—it is almost—I want to use moderate language—I think it is revolting what the Maritime Commission paid for some of those ships after they were requisitioned and used by your Government to supply your troops who are fighting for \$50 a month. I am not going to call the names of the ship companies, but I have the names of the ships and their age and what the ship operator paid for them, and I have the figure as to what the taxpayers had to pay back when they were sunk, and in addition to that we have the figures here to show how much they were paid for charter hire, rent, so to speak, before they were sunk.

Incidentally there were 754 of these cargo ships sunk during World War II. Here is one, the *Alcoa Leader*. It was built in 1919. It was sunk on June 30, 1944. That would make the ship about 25 years old when it was sunk. It had been depreciated at the rate of 5 percent for every year for 20 years. So it had been paid for a long time before it was ever sunk. The operator paid \$210,000 for it, and the amount paid by the taxpayers was \$435,307 when it was sunk. That is for a 25-year-old ship that was depreciated.

That is not all. During the time that the Government used that ship the Government paid him \$1,048,000 charter hire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] yield me 3 minutes? I just want to read two or three more of these figures.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this table of information I have here is prepared by the Maritime Administration. It is just a sample of the information they usually give out. I have never heard of the Maritime Administration giving you their best or their worst. They usually just go down the middle. These are the commission's figures, and not mine.

Here is another ship, the *Tachira*. That ship was built in 1920, it was sunk

on July 12, 1942. The acquisition cost to the owner was \$45,600. When it was sunk the taxpayers of the United States paid \$256,200 for a ship that was 22 years old, and for which the owner only paid \$45,000. That is not all. The Government operated it for only 2 months and paid them an additional \$47,800. That is the sum total of the cost for a 21- or 22-year-old ship.

Here is another ship, the *Hon Omu*. That ship was built in 1919. It was sunk on July 5, 1942. That makes the ship 23 years old. The acquisition cost to the owner, according to the Maritime Administration, was \$127,000. The Maritime Administration says that when it was sunk the owner received—how much? \$768,000. Let us see how much the Government paid in addition to that for charter hire and fees during that time. The Government only chartered it for about 4 months and they paid \$129,615 extra beside that \$768,000.

Mr. Speaker, all this language does is to seek to prevent that happening again. That great committee is headed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey. He is a great American, the head of a great committee. Their committee had 5 years to do this, and they have not seen fit to do it. That is their business and not ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to submit a consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The appropriation bill should of course, come before the House, and it will come before the House anyway. The only question is whether you are going to vote for a rule waiving points of order. As has been stated repeatedly, this would oust the appropriate standing committees of the House of their jurisdiction. No matter how good you may conceive the legislation in this appropriation bill to be, it is not the way to legislate; it is not a desirable thing to oust legislative committees from their appropriate jurisdiction.

I have very little to say about the housing legislation. The point is that surely you can control the amount of housing to be constructed by the quantum of the appropriation you allow. I do not see why the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency should be done in this bill, although I did not agree with what the Committee on Banking and Currency did in the first place and I did not vote for the housing legislation which I never considered good legislation.

Now, coming to this merchant-marine provision on page 49, we find a particularly striking case. I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when in the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed the ship sales bill which passed the House almost unanimously. It may very well be that if the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when it was considering the ship sales bill, had realized the tremen-

dous increase in price that was going to occur, it would have fixed a different formula for the selling price of ships. But we fixed the statutory selling price in good faith. Surely, nobody who bought a war-built ship at the statutory price can be criticized for doing it. You will have in mind that we deliberately fixed a statutory sales price that we thought would move these ships. A provision closely resembling that found in H. R. 3880 was offered as an amendment to the Ship Sales Act and was rejected.

The provision on page 49 of the bill not only is new legislation; it also amends the Constitution of the United States, because the Constitution of the United States provides that property shall not be taken without due process of law. It provides for a fair value to be paid to the owner whose property is involuntarily taken. This is true in war as in peace. Ship owners, like other people, have suffered a great appreciation in the value of their property. You could, of course, pass legislation providing that nobody in the District of Columbia should sell a house for more than he paid for it 5 or 10 years ago, but I do not believe you would want to pass such legislation, and I do not believe the courts would concede the constitutionality of it or give it effect. Why should you confiscate the property of a shipowner more readily than that of a home owner.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. I just want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think that all we are trying to pass on is whether or not the Committee on Appropriations shall be a superlegislative committee over every other committee.

Mr. HALE. Exactly. That will be the effect if you adopt this rule. Not only that but in this case you will, as I say, amend the Constitution of the United States, which the Congress cannot do by ordinary statute even when emanating from a committee having jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this rule subject to amendment before it is voted on?

The SPEAKER. Not if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Before the previous question is ordered, it is subject to amendment, is it?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois yields for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield? I would like to submit an amendment and ask a question to go along with it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that if he yields to the gentleman from Mississippi to offer an amendment, the gentleman from Mississippi will control an hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a plea of guilty by Members of the Committee on Rules and my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee. They have made the same defense that the old colored man made when he was accused of stealing a pair of pants. He said, "If the motive is right, where is the sin? I stole the breeches to be baptized in."

I would be recreant to my trust if I did not protest against this invasion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the other committees. The parliamentary rules have been built up by experience of mankind, by trial and error, like the common law which Blackstone is the perfection of human reasoning. They are a wise code of rules and those who have served here long are constantly made conscious that they are fundamentally sound. One of the most important of these rules is that no legislation shall be written on an appropriation bill.

The Appropriations Committee does not have to have a rule for the consideration of its bills. These bills come here ordinarily without a rule for their consideration. However, in this case they went before the Rules Committee and got a rule which provides that no points of order may be made against the bill or any provisions of it. Thereby they invaded those committees which had jurisdiction under the rules of the House in reference to legislative provisions incorporated in the bill. Rules prohibiting points of order may sometimes be justified when applied solely to clerical errors or technical objections; but they should not be made to invade the fundamental principles and the fundamental rules of the House.

In order to proceed under orderly processes, we must have legislative committees. The jurisdiction of those committees is as well defined as the jurisdiction of the courts. Those committees have a peculiar knowledge of the subjects that come before them because of the constant hearings and the constant experience with those subjects.

The gentlemen favoring the rule by their debate here miss the fundamental question of violation. They are justifying their action in overriding the legislative committees in a way that makes me feel like saying: "Upon what meat have these our Caesars fed that they have grown so great?" They have not denied that this is a violation of the fundamental rules of the House. They have said, "We did violate them, but we know more than the committees that have jurisdiction over these matters, we know more than the committees that have considered these things; therefore, we substitute our judgment for their judgment."

They have looted our committees today, they will gut yours tomorrow if you establish this principle. Have you any feeling of interest in your committee? Do you want to see the integrity of your committee preserved? Do you want to see it retain its jurisdiction? If you do, you had better vote down this rule.

The legislation here involved is immaterial. The fundamental question is whether you are going to let the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee take over the legislation of the House. If you want to do that you may make an easy life for yourself, but it seems to me it will be a retreat from the duties that are imposed upon you.

I ask the Members to vote down this resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the House created the Appropriations Committee, within the memory of many people now sitting on this floor today, to keep Members of the House out of trouble. I think this is one time when the Appropriations Committee has been diligent by the action it has taken in reference to this bill to keep the Members out of trouble.

We are going to answer, by our vote upon the rule, and I personally hope it will be a vote in favor of the rule, five very simple questions. Those questions are: Do you believe this is an emergency? Do you believe that this is a war? Do you believe that money should be spent for the defense of the United States and that, therefore, all other expenditures of the United States domestically should be reduced as much as possible? Do we believe that the unlimited expenditure of Federal money has a direct effect toward inflation, and, in very simple language, do we believe in economy? Those questions you will answer by yes or no by your vote upon the rule. As long as I have been upon the Committee on Appropriations, which is 5 years, subcommittees have come before the Rules Committee asking for closed rules. I think in the session before last, the Eighty-first Congress, a majority of the Appropriation Subcommittees asked for rules waiving points of order, and it gives me a certain slight amusement to hear the gentleman from Kentucky object to this rule on the ground that it waives points of order when the Committee on Banking and Currency has itself frequently gone before the Committee on Rules and asked for rules waiving points of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not at the moment, but I will later. If you wish to discuss jurisdiction, in which I have no particular interest, the Committee on Banking and Currency took jurisdiction from the Committee on Appropriations when it passed the housing bill and bypassed the Committee on Appropriations and gave a blank check upon the taxpayers of the United States for a period of years amounting to about \$17,000,000,000. That is a point where jurisdiction was seized by the Banking and Currency Committee and not by us.

We do not want particularly to make legislation; I do not think any Appropriation Subcommittee does, but there are times when a legislative committee does not have time; perhaps, for some reason it has not been able to meet and to do those things which should be done in this bill and which are necessary in

the emergency which faces the United States. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, that is going to prevent the Committee on Banking and Currency from meeting and working out some of the things they want or the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from meeting and working out some of the things it wants, but the fact remains that those committees have not met to do the things that are done in this bill. This is your chance to answer the questions which I asked: Are you for economy? Do you believe that Federal spending increases inflation? Do you believe this is an emergency and do you believe that in wartime we should limit domestic spending and spend for the defense of the country? Those are the questions before us.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, as my very good friend from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, there is no reason for heat being employed on this occasion. The proposition involved here is a fundamental one, and that is whether the rules of the House and whether the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the House are to be suspended by the House or whether encroachments upon those several jurisdictions and violations of those rules are to be condoned by the House.

The only purpose of the rule upon which we are soon to act, the rule which waives points of order on H. R. 3880 is to validate what is admitted to be legislation contained in an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. I do not desire to go into the merits of the legislation, particularly. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stated that the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations was to get Members of the House out of trouble. If rules of this nature are to be continued, if there is to be a continuous ouster of jurisdiction of legislative committees, then the Committee on Appropriations is going to get the country into trouble, and if the legislative provisions of H. R. 3880 prevail, at least with respect to the operations of the Maritime Commission, our country will be in trouble. The gentleman from Texas fulminated against the prices paid to many people who had bought ships from the Government. Under previous legislation the Maritime Commission was permitted to enter into negotiations with the ship owners on the question of just compensation. Under the previous law and existing law they were permitted to offer larger amounts to those owners than would be permitted under the provisions of H. R. 3880. But, the question of just compensation cannot be defined by a legislative body. The Constitution of the United States and the fifth amendment say that everybody shall be given just compensation for private property taken or requisitioned by the Government.

What does the record show? The record shows even in the light of larger sums that were offered by the Government in the negotiations, when the ship owners refused to accept such sums and

brought their cases into the courts, the courts in the over-all picture awarded the owners 161 percent of what the Maritime Commission had offered.

You cannot take away the jurisdiction of the courts by a provision of this nature. This not only seeks to oust the legislative committees of their jurisdiction but the courts of the United States of their jurisdiction. If by any chance it should be passed, the courts will repel it as being completely unconstitutional.

The gentleman from Texas never referred at all to another provision in this bill that limits the number of voyages in the fiscal year 1952 that may be authorized by the Maritime Administration to 1,450.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That particular point is not subject to a point of order. It does not come under the rule.

Mr. HART. That is the opinion of the gentleman from California. That may be the reason the gentleman from Texas did not mention it. Nevertheless, there is some doubt as to whether a point of order could be made against that provision because, if enacted into law, it would result in the violation of contracts already existing between the Maritime Administration and the shipowners and operators of the United States.

The Maritime Administrator requested that there be authorized in this appropriation bill sufficient funds for a minimum of 1,523 voyages. Even then it is questionable whether 1,523 voyages would satisfy the contractual commitments of the Maritime Administration.

But arbitrarily and without recognition of the request of the Maritime Administrator, the subcommittee has cut down the number of voyages authorized to 1,450, an increase of 16 over those which are estimated to take place in the fiscal year 1951.

I talked this morning on the telephone with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration, Admiral Cochrane. Admiral Cochrane has been commended by the gentleman from Texas as one of the finest administrators in the history of the country. With that estimate of him I fully agree. Yet, he casts aside completely, and his subcommittee casts aside completely, the recommendation of Admiral Cochrane with reference to the number of voyages that will be required in the interests of the United States and the United States merchant marine in the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous principle, this business of permitting continual and ever greater encroachment upon the legislative committees of the House by the Appropriations Committee. It is a fundamental principle. It is the only real principle involved. I appeal to those Members who do not approve of the continuance of that practice to vote down this rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the few minutes allotted to me I may be able to discuss the rule

which is before us, and perhaps clarify some of the misunderstandings which seemingly are apparent here today.

In the beginning, may I point out that when this bill and the application for this rule were before the Committee on Rules we were advised there were eight provisions in the bill which would be subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill? Of course, under the rules of the House, legislation cannot be made a part of an appropriation bill unless points of order are waived. The waiving of points of order, as provided in this rule, does simply one thing—and I wish to make this very clear—it permits the membership of the House to pass upon each of these eight provisions upon its merits. The rule does not provide these eight provisions shall be enacted into law. Voting for this rule does not approve a single one of these provisions. The rule simply sets aside the right of one individual Member of the House to prevent, by his objection, or by the making of a point of order, the majority of the House of Representatives from working its will on that particular section of the bill.

I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for our legislative committees. In the long years I have served on the Committee on Rules, I have usually opposed the granting of rules carrying a waiver of points of order. Yet I am not unmindful of the fact that every legislative committee of the House, almost without exception, and I dare say without a single exception, has come before the Committee on Rules and requested a waiver of points of order. I am not unmindful of the fact that when the great Committee on Banking and Currency brought in the housing bill, which is dealt with in this appropriation bill, it had been so written as to entirely bypass the Committee on Appropriations, so that the money was appropriated at the very same time the authorization was approved. Therefore, the only way in the world the House of Representatives can pass upon the particular housing question involved in this bill is through the adoption of this rule. Otherwise, we will never have an opportunity to pass upon it.

It is exactly true, as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky said a few moments ago, the House did approve the legislative bill to which he alluded, and of which mention has been made here, but it is equally true that after the present great conflict developed in Korea, and we realized we might have to fight a war for survival, and his committee brought in another bill for another great housing project and spending program, the House of Representatives voted it down, or rather flatly refused to even consider that legislation. And it has not been brought back to the floor yet. The House of Representatives, like everyone else, certainly should have the right to change its positions and opinions in view of changing conditions. That is all this rule permits. It simply gives to us, the Members of the House of Representatives, the opportunity to determine for ourselves whether certain expenditures for certain purposes should be made, or

whether they should be turned down; whether there should now be some restrictions placed on them, whether we should go ahead with these gigantic building programs which were barely approved when we thought we had peace, and perhaps might face a depression; or whether we should suspend that program for the present, at least.

I am sure the members of our different legislative committees who have spoken here today are able men, honest and sincere men. But they can present their points of view on these different sections of the bill to the House, providing we adopt this rule. If they can convince the House their position is right, the House will go along with them and strike such sections from the bill, or amend them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield just for a brief question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield at this time and I will appreciate it if the gentleman will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the members of the different legislative committees who have spoken here today think they are correct in what they have said as to the provisions of this bill, certainly, with all of their ability and great oratorical prowess, they can convince the majority of the House to vote with them; and if the majority of the House desires to place any limitations upon these Government expenditures in view of the great national emergency with which we are now faced, that it is right and proper we should be just a little careful as to how we spend our public moneys, that we ought to postpone some of these great projects which have been authorized in the past for a while, then the House can and will so vote.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker—
Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have not even had an opportunity to ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman cannot contribute anything worth while to this discussion or debate, and I refuse to yield.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether you want to save at least \$750,000,000, at the minimum, and the savings may go to as much as \$2,000,000,000, if this rule is adopted, or whether we want to go ahead and spend these vast sums.

If those who oppose this rule can convince us that we should go ahead and spend this money, if they can convince us by logic, the Members of the House, a majority of us, that we should strike out of this bill these provisions, then these provisions can and will be stricken. But unless they can convince the ma-

jority of the House that it should have no right to pass upon these special provisions in this bill, then vote "No." All the Committee on Rules is giving in submitting this rule, the right for the House to decide for itself what it wants to do. A vote of "Yes" will give each of us that right. A "No" vote is a vote against permitting the House to work its will on these important questions—a vote against economy, a vote for waste and extravagance—at a time when our country must conserve its strength in the face of great peril.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

STAND BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the views of the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency and Merchant Marine. Today their jurisdiction is invaded, and tomorrow the Appropriations Committee will poach on the preserves of Judiciary and next day Foreign Affairs. Precedents have a habit of begetting precedents. Finally the Appropriations Committee becomes the arbiter of our fate—becomes the congressional pooh bah.

It is not a question of economy or otherwise. The vote is for the sanctity of the jurisdiction of standing committees. That is all.

We inveigh against the habit in the other body of placing legislative provisions on our appropriation bills. We cannot complain, if we pass this rule. The other group will say: Before you take the mote out of my eye look to the beam in your own. We become guilty of the abuse against which we usually inveigh.

There were no public hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Disinterested witnesses were not heard. Only Government witnesses appeared. Before standing committees both sides of a controversy are heard. In the interest of fairness and orderly procedure vote down this rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously interested in the rights and prerogatives of the legislative committees of this body, and I think all Members should be interested in that subject. I have no difference with the Appropriations Committee for the amount of money they bring in to carry out legislative items that have been authorized.

The gentleman from Ohio is very ticklish about the rules of the House and the prerogatives that he enjoys on the floor of this House, but he does not seem to be interested in the prerogatives and rights of the legislative committees of this House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said that it is the right of every man to change his mind. I am changing my mind and am going to vote against this rule.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask just one very brief question? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Rules reported out this rule by a vote of 6 to 5?

Mr. BONNER. I so understand.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the legislation carried in this bill there is the directive to the Maritime Board with respect to contracts that have been made, contracts that run for 10 years. These contracts are not made from year to year; they are made over a period of 10 years with shipping companies to provide service just like the railroads provide service between Washington and New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I cannot yield.

I leave to the Members who are constitutional lawyers and know more about contracts than I whether or not the United States Government would not get into serious trouble over these contracts that are worked out, if the provisions in this appropriation bill are adopted?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever raised my voice against a rule. In this case I believe and feel positive I am correct. Therefore I hope the House votes down the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on a resolution which, in many respects, may seem routine and on which many Members may base their vote on partisan considerations or on the narrow issues relating to the independent offices appropriation bill which House Resolution 220 involves. Much of the debate has centered on those factors. I want to express my own very strong feeling that the basic issue involved in House Resolution 220 is not a matter in which the partisan conflict nor monetary expediency should dictate a choice of position.

The issues involved here are far larger than that. House Resolution 220, by waiving points of order against the legislation written into H. R. 3880, violates a principle upon which the entire legislative organization of Congress is based. It also violates a basic principle of plain common sense. Congress has always recognized that no one Member, nor any small group of Members, can hope to fully understand and cope with the details of the innumerable matters that come before us for action. It was on the basis of that common-sense principle that the committee system was established both in the House and in the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations was established to deal with the allocation of funds for Government activities; it was not established to legislate the details of how the expenditure of funds should be administered and regulated.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was set up to recommend legislative action on administrative and regulative matters pertaining to the maritime affairs of the United States; it does not and should not presume to encroach on the money-spending functions of the Committee on Appropriations. The same considerations apply to every legislative committee established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is not simply a matter of courtesy or formality. It is a dictate of absolute necessity. When the Committee on Appropriations presumes to encroach on the legislative jurisdiction and prerogatives of other committees of the House—as it does in many instances in H. R. 3880—its members cannot possibly have a full understanding of all the factors involved in the legislation they write. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other members of his subcommittee have stressed the point that all they are trying to do is to save money for the Government in this time of financial strain. I submit that when they write hasty and ill-conceived legislation into any appropriation bill, without full knowledge of the background situation, they open wide the door for the expenditure of much greater amounts of money than they save. In many cases they make inevitable the wastage and loss of sums already spent. You cannot prevent inefficiency when the people laying down the rules are like fish out of water. No Congressman can familiarize himself with all the details of all the vast operations with which this Government concerns itself, any more than a fish can learn to breathe air. No member of the Committee on Appropriations can hope to know as much about any particular legislative matter as the members of the committee which deal with that particular problem every day. When a committee steps out of its own field it can only create chaos, confusion, and cross-purpose. It certainly cannot save money in the long run.

It is true that I am opposed to some of the legislation written into the independent offices appropriation bill. I particularly oppose certain features applying to the work of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I am a member. I also oppose the legislation on public housing which has been taken out of the hands of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of the legislation introduced into the bill may be sound. Regardless of that fact, I am frank enough to admit that I do not feel capable of passing judgment on all of it. I am also frank enough to say I do not believe the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee are capable of passing sound judgment on all of it without the advice and studied consideration of members of the separate committees which should have written the legislation.

I appeal to my colleagues in the House to base their vote on this resolution, not on the basis of party but on the basis of partnership in a common effort which is bound to suffer if the dictates of common

sense and the rules of organization of this House are discarded. The continual waiving of points of order against legislation in appropriations bills carries an inherent danger which should override any other question in our minds. Now is the time when we should all stand together against that danger. I ask that the rule be refused by vote of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 159, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—220

Aandahl	Evins	Meador
Abbott	Fellows	Morrow
Abernethy	Fenton	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Fernandez	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Morano
Allen, La.	Ford	Morton
Andersen	Forrester	Mumma
H. Carl	Fulton	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Norblad
Andresen	Gary	Norrell
August H.	Gathings	O'Hara
Andrews	Gavin	Passman
Angell	George	Patten
Arends	Golden	Patterson
Armstrong	Goodwin	Phillips
Auchincloss	Gore	Pickett
Ayres	Gossett	Potter
Baker	Graham	Poulson
Bates, Ky.	Grant	Radwan
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Battle	Gwinn	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hall	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Edwin Arthur	Rees, Kans.
Beckworth	Hall	Regan
Belcher	Leonard W.	Riehman
Bender	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Rogers, Mass.
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Sadlak
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	St. George
Betts	Harvey	Schwabe
Bishop	Hays, Ark.	Schvner
Blackney	Hedrick	Scudder
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Shafer
Bolton	Herter	Sheehan
Bow	Hess	Sheppard
Bray	Hill	Short
Brehm	Hillings	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Simpson, Ill.
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	Sittler
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Holmes	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Horan	Smith, Va.
Busbey	Hunter	Smith, Wis.
Bush	Jackson, Calif.	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Stanley
Chenoweth	Jenison	Stefan
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Sutton
Church	Jensen	Taber
Clevenger	Jonas	Talle
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Colmer	Jones	Teague
Cooper	Hamilton C.	Thomas
Corbett	Jones	Thompson
Cotton	Woodrow W.	Mich.
Coudert	Kean	Van Pelt
Cox	Kearns	Van Zandt
Crawford	Kilburn	Vaughn
Crumpacker	Kilday	Velde
Cunningham	Lantaff	Vors
Curtis, Nebr.	Larcade	Vursell
Dague	LeCompte	Werdel
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Wharton
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Wheeler
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Whitten
Dempsey	McCulloch	Wigglesworth
Denny	McDonough	Williams, Miss.
Devereux	McGregor	Williams, N. Y.
D'Ewart	McMillan	Willis
Dolliver	McMullen	Wilson, Ind.
Dondero	McVey	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Mack, Wash.	Winstead
Eaton	Mahon	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	Wood, Ga.
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Wood, Idaho
Engle	Mason	

NAYS—159

Addonizio	Green	O'Konski
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	O'Neill
Anfuso	Hagen	Ostertag
Aspinall	Hale	O'Toole
Bailey	Hand	Perkins
Barden	Hart	Philbin
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Blatnik	Heffernan	Polk
Boggs, La	Heller	Preston
Bolling	Heseltun	Priest
Bonner	Hope	Prouty
Bosone	Howell	Quinn
Boykin	Hull	Rabaut
Breen	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rankin
Bryson	Javits	Reams
Burdick	Johnson	Rhodes
Burnside	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
Butler	Judd	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Camp	Keating	Roberts
Canfield	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Carlyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Carnahan	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Case	Kerr	Rooney
Celler	King	Roosevelt
Chelf	Kirwan	Sabath
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Sasser
Clemente	Lane	Saylor
Combs	Lanham	Scott
Crosser	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Deane	Lesinski	Secret
Delaney	Lind	Seely-Brown
Denton	Lucas	Shelley
Dollinger	McCarthy	Spence
Donohue	McCormack	Staggers
Donovan	McGrath	Tackett
Dorn	McGuire	Thompson, Tex.
Doyle	McKinnon	Thornberry
Durham	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Towe
Elliott	Madden	Trimble
Feighan	Magee	Walter
Fine	Marshall	Weichel
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Weich
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Wickersham
Forand	Mitchell	Wier
Frazier	Morgan	Withrow
Fugate	Moulder	Wolverton
Furcolo	Multer	Yates
Garmatz	Murdock	Yorty
Gordon	Nelson	Zablocki
Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.	
Granger	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—54

Albert	Halleck	Patman
Bakewell	Havener	Powell
Barrett	Hébert	Price
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Rains
Brooks	Hollfield	Redden
Buckley	Irving	Rivers
Burton	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Cannon	Kee	Sieminski
Chatham	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Cooley	Klein	Stigler
Curtis, Mo.	Mansfield	Stockman
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Vall
DeGraffenried	Morris	Vinson
Dingell	Morrison	Watts
Fallon	Murphy	Whitaker
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Widnall
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Klein against.
 Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Murphy against.
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Price against.
 Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Patman against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Mansfield against.
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Hollfield against.
 Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Havener against.
 Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
 Mr. Burton for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bakewell.

XCVII—303

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Vall.
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. Stockman.
 Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Stigler with Mr. Hardie Scott.
 Mr. Vinson with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSECUTION OF PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, has taken occasion to, from the well of the House, or by the insertion of matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, make reference to certain court proceedings involving Edward Rumely. On several occasions reply has been made to those statements by me, but notwithstanding the fact that the unfairness and injustice, at least in my opinion, of the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been pointed out, he continues a course which begins to have the appearance of a persecution. I do not actually know why Mr. PATMAN follows this course which he certainly must know does not accurately portray the activities of Mr. Rumely.

Mr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has long circulated books and statements made by Members of Congress, including some made by your humble servant which tend to support our form of government. Some who evidently do not believe in our form of government, who apparently would, by force or otherwise, change that form of government, have over the years consistently endeavored by false statements to discredit Mr. Rumely which does Mr. Rumely a grave injustice.

Mr. Rumely is an officer of an organization—the Committee for Constitutional Government—which is endeavoring, by printing and distributing speeches, documents, pamphlets, and books, to maintain constitutional government. It is a nonprofit, educational organization.

Mr. Rumely was recently convicted of contempt of Congress because he refused to give a House committee the names of individuals who contributed to his activities. In my humble judgment, as long as the publications sent out by an individual or organization are informative, educational, truthful, and tend in no way to encourage subversive activities, their publication and circulation is no concern of the Congress. Efforts which tend to prevent their publication or circulation tend to a denial of a free press, of free speech.

To state the proposition in a different way—as long as no fault can be found with the contents of the publications sent out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, what right has the Congress to insist that it be told who pays for the publication or circulation of these books or documents?

The House Committee on Lobbying, before which Mr. Rumely appeared, apparently confined its inquiries as to lobbying to organizations which advo-

cate constitutional government, or government under the Constitution. It apparently made little, if any, attempt to inquire into the activities of so-called subversive organizations, who financed those organizations, or who was back of them or their purpose.

To state the situation in other language—apparently, the committee was on a “witch hunt” for three organizations which had effectively taught Americanism, was not interested in unpatriotic groups. In my humble judgment it is a sad, sad day when a committee of Congress follows a course which tends to discourage the teaching of Americanism; which by its inaction, encourages those who apparently do not believe in the Constitution, who do not like government under the Constitution as strictly construed. The activities of those who guided the House Committee on Lobbying seem to be a sort of hang-over from the outfits which, not so many years ago, resented any criticism of Communists or of communistic doctrine.

I recently received a letter from the Committee for Constitutional Government which reads as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR
CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
New York, N. Y., April, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Several Members of Congress inquired some time ago whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, had any comment upon charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. I did write a reply but inasmuch as Dr. Rumely was to go on trial on a contempt charge, I withheld my letter on advice of his counsel.

I now find that all jurors connected with Dr. Rumely's trial have received a pamphlet, containing charges by Mr. PATMAN similar to those he made March 7.

In my letter, I raised the question whether those charges were made to influence a Washington jury. The fact that the jurors received this pamphlet strengthens that surmise. My letter, as originally written, follows:

“In response to inquiries whether Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of this committee, has any comment upon the charges made in the House on March 7 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, Dr. Rumely says: ‘I will uphold even Mr. PATMAN's right to say anything so long as it is the truth and not libelous. Beyond that, I prefer not to comment.’

“As you doubtless know, Dr. Rumely is scheduled to go on trial before a District of Columbia jury on a charge of contempt of Congress in refusing to comply with a demand by the political majority of the Buchanan lobby committee that he reveal the names of bulk purchasers of this committee's literature. This is no ordinary contempt of Congress case in which defendants have been indicted for not answering questions about Communist affiliations or for refusal to answer on self-incriminatory grounds. Dr. Rumely's forthcoming trial ranks in importance with the trial of Peter Zenger which established in America the legal principle of freedom of the press. For the issue at stake in the Rumely trial is whether a factional majority has the right to compel a publisher to name the purchasers of books, containing views opposed to those of that faction.

“The place and timing, then, of Representative PATMAN's attack upon Dr. Rumely have greater and more sinister significance than the purport of his semipsychopathic

remarks. For Mr. PATMAN spoke in the District of Columbia. Dr. Rumely will be tried by a jury composed of residents in the District of Columbia. What other purpose had Mr. PATMAN than the possibility of prejudicing those who might be called as jurors? That he had a planned purpose is obvious, for his unfounded charges have been picked up by the more radical of the labor press with a unanimity that can scarcely be a coincidence.

"Our examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals that during the last 7 years, Mr. PATMAN has delivered in the House of Representatives a total of 29 attacks upon Dr. Rumely. Once he worked himself up into such a state that he made three attacks the same legislative day. Should this curious persistence come under examination of a psychiatrist, an expected diagnosis might be megalomania.

"In his 29 diatribes, Mr. PATMAN has termed Dr. Rumely a Fascist, a German spy, a superinternational lobbyist, a traitor to the Nation, a diabolical operator, a despicable character, and an American Judas Iscariot. Although such invective and grave accusation pepper his remarks with what appears to be reckless abandon, Mr. PATMAN has exercised extraordinary caution: not once, so far as we of this committee have been able to discover, has he made his now familiar speech outside the comfortably safe shield of congressional immunity. We doubt that he ever will.

"One gathers from Mr. PATMAN's privileged remarks that he considers Dr. Rumely far beneath association with upright men. This is a reflection that such men as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Ford, and William E. Borah are unable to return from the grave to refute. With these men and many more of similar uprightness Dr. Rumely has worked in closest association and confidence.

"Mr. PATMAN describes Dr. Rumely as a German spy trying to direct thought control in the United States. Time was when he pronounced Dr. Rumely's work a great service. Before the Committee for Constitutional Government was organized, Dr. Rumely was the organizer and executive secretary of the Committee for the Nation, an organization of businessmen, farm leaders, and economists which was in high favor at the White House before the New Deal went chasing butterflies and socialism. And some of the most appreciative letters written from Congress to the Committee for the Nation came from Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. 'I am reading all the information you send me,' Mr. PATMAN wrote Dr. Rumely's organization. 'You are rendering the Members of Congress and the country a great service.'

"Dr. Rumely and other members of the Committee for the Nation held frequent meetings in Mr. PATMAN's office. Then that committee was fighting for a stable dollar and the principles of the Goldsborough bill and Mr. PATMAN gave all-out support. Today the Committee for Constitutional Government is fighting for the identical dollar stability to which PATMAN at that time gave all-out endorsement, and Dr. Rumely, as executive secretary, is acting in the same capacity as he acted for the Committee for the Nation.

"The 29 diatribes of Mr. PATMAN center around the trial of Dr. Rumely and two partners of the law firm of which the well-known liberal Arthur Garfield Hays was a member on charges of concealing German Government ownership of the New York Evening Mail. The circumstances of the trial and its aftermath help to explain Dr. Rumely's dedication to the cause of upholding constitutional rights.

"Back in 1915, Dr. Rumely bought the Evening Mail and was indebted for some of the purchase money to an American citizen then living in Germany. It was then during

World War I, which the United States had not yet entered, that funds from private persons were transmitted to this country through the German Government.

"After the United States became a belligerent, Dr. Rumely reported to the Alien Property Custodian indebtedness to the individual in question. The Government maintained that the money was furnished by the German Government, and Dr. Rumely and his two legal advisers were indicted for conspiracy to violate the Trading With the Enemy Act.

"The trial involved this technical charge. It was long and complex, and a jury found Dr. Rumely and his codefendants guilty. In a subsequent statement, a majority of the jurors declared that 'it was our disposition to give the Government the benefit of whatever doubt existed' and that had they known of evidence that was suppressed at the trial, 'this new evidence would have altered our verdict.'

"The jurors also petitioned to have their verdict set aside. Both the trial judge and the chief prosecutor recommended a pardon. The facts of the case were studied by Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States. Mr. Stone wrote President Coolidge to the effect that in his opinion there was absence of adequate evidence of criminal intent in the case, that the defendants had been gravely prejudiced in their trial and that they were in fact innocent, notwithstanding the judgment of conviction and its affirmance. The President issued unconditional pardons to all three defendants.

"All Dr. Rumely's civil rights were restored, but the two lawyers were still disbarred. Leaders of the Bar Association pressed their case, and the lawyers were reinstated by Chief Justice Cardozo of the New York Court of Appeals, who sensed 'an abiding and reasoned distrust of the verdict.'

"A pardon may in some conditions be a warning," said Judge Cardozo, 'as significant as a judgment of reversal that the looms of the law have woven a fabric of injustice. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration. The record makes it plain that the pardon was granted because the President of the United States was advised by his Attorney General that the petitioners were innocent.'

"But you do not say a person is not guilty because he was pardoned,' Mr. PATMAN insisted in the House, March 7. 'There is no reason to pardon unless guilt is involved.'

"Such reasoning in the face of the Cardozo opinion that the defendants were wrongly convicted belongs with the wonderful nonsense of Alice in Wonderland and Alice Through the Looking Glass. It reflects the logic of the Mad Hatter, the jurisprudence of the Red Queen. 'When I use a word,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

"If Mr. PATMAN is right about Dr. Rumely, then the trial judge, the chief prosecutor, the jurors, Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Cardozo of the Supreme Court of the United States were wrong."

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL
GOVERNMENT,
SUMNER GERARD, *Trustee*.

P. S.—I attach hereto an office memorandum that contains the quotation from the court record for April 25, while tampering with the jury—by distributing the WRIGHT PATMAN statement—was under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, that memorandum reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 27, 1951.

The proceedings to investigate the mailing of the WRIGHT PATMAN smear material to all jurors brought out some interesting facts.

On April 25 the judge called the jurors together, found that all had received a copy of the Patman smear booklet. The court clerk had identified a man who attended all the sessions of the Rumely trial as the one who asked how he might get a copy of the names and addresses of all the jurors. Said clerk directed the inquirer to the proper source and later saw the man with a young woman copying the names.

The clerk also identified the man as one with whom he had seen Mr. Hitz, the Government prosecutor, in conversation.

"Mr. Hitz, I remember that and I would like to describe him; maybe you would recognize him from the description. He was short, about 5 feet 6—I don't remember that he was stocky; I would say just small; and he had medium-colored brown hair; he had eyeglasses and he had quite a Jewish cast to his face, and that individual is named Goodman or Goldman, but in any event he is the local lobbyist for Walter Reuther.

"I remember a conversation of that sort or in that place, so that this also might mean something to Mr. Fitzgerald. The conversation concerned the desire of Walter Reuther, in the event the Government should convict in this case, to be allowed to file a brief amicus curiae in the court of appeals in support of the conviction, and in that conversation I said that if they made any effort to do it, I would oppose it. There is a possible party who was there throughout the trial and who I do remember talking to; that might be of some help.

"Mr. BURKINSHAW. May I express an opinion on the record? The girl involved is the reporter for the CIO newspaper."

It seems very likely that this Mr. Goodman is none other than the Leo Goodman, director of the CIO National Housing Committee, who testified before the Buchanan committee and attacked the CCG and its activities, including our sending out franked material.

Louis Little, the first counsel to the Buchanan committee, on his first visit to our offices said, "If you're going to publish a book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law? and if the labor leaders do not like that, why shouldn't they know if their bosses, in a city like Milwaukee, buy that book in quantities and distribute it?"

During the whole proceedings the labor press, directly informed by Buchanan, had carried on, week by week, a bitter campaign, featuring attacks upon us. Frank Edwards, A. F. of L. radio commentator, gave up part of his radio time for Frank Buchanan's libelous attacks upon us, charging that our book sales were a phony sales dodge the night before Dr. Rumely's first appearance before the Buchanan committee. This showed a carefully planned campaign, worked out in advance, centering upon book sales because of the mass distribution of The Road Ahead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday next, after the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus,

boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and half by the majority on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3880, with Mr. CHELF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for 2 hours.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me discuss the high points in the bill for just a few minutes. I respectfully ask the membership to turn to the report of the committee. Our clerks, Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin, have worked hard upon this report. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], myself, and other members of the committee have changed and revised, changed again and revised further, and we commend it to you; we think it is complete and that it will give you a lot of meat, particularly the facts and figures in most, if not all, of the big items.

If you will turn to the tabulation in the back of the report you will find two plus items over the 1952 budget estimates. But that is misleading as to the item for the National Capital Housing Authority. The budget left that item out. As well as I remember it was only \$32,000 for operating expenses, and the way the budget had set it up was that it would bypass the Congress and use its own funds. Therefore when the committee got a look at its operating expense it changed the budget language and put it back in the hands of the House, as formerly, where the Congress could appropriate the Housing people's own money, so technically it is carried as a plus over the budget when in truth and in fact it is not. In effect, you do not appropriate additional money; you merely give them authority under direction of the Congress to use funds deposited by the Authority into the Treasury.

There is another item in the tabulation which has a plus sign, and the remainder of the 40 or 50 items have minus signs under the budget estimates. The committee after much friendly argument, and I might say that there is not any partisanship on this committee because it deals with independent agencies

purely—90 percent of them—boards and commissions on which both parties are represented; therefore we do take a non-partisan attitude. But as I say we compromised our differences and we went above the budget in allowing \$65 a month to about 800 cadet midshipmen in the Merchant Marine School at Kings Point, N. Y. Outside of those items there were no increases.

We think the language in the bill saves many millions of dollars. This bill, of course, is made up of a great many items, some 35 agencies, and some of the agencies consist of two or three parts. Take, for instance, the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is made up of the Office of the Administrator, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Home Loan Bank Board. And while I am mentioning HOLC, let me give you this news, if I may. In 1934, if my memory serves me correctly, the Congress created the old Home Owners Loan Corporation. Mr. Chairman, you are through with it now. We wound it up this year and you will not have to look at it any more I hope. What a grand job they have done. When it is all wound up you will find it has not cost the taxpayers of this country one red cent. On the contrary, it has turned back into the Treasury, after doing this magnificent job, a profit of \$15,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to that, it saved thousands and thousands of homes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which is not only valuable from the material angle but also from the spiritual and the governmental angle because family life is the basis of society.

Mr. THOMAS. They did a magnificent job for thousands and thousands of home owners.

Mr. McCORMACK. All under Democratic administrations.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are three big items in the bill. One of them is for the Veterans' Administration. There has been a big reduction from last year amounting to about \$1,832,095,000. Appropriations for 1951 amounted to nearly \$6,000,000,000 and next year they will be about \$4,000,000,000. That comes about in spite of the fact that we are going to put in operation in 1952 10,250 new hospital beds and, incidentally, we grant them 10,895 new employees, more than one new employee to every bed. So we are taking care of our sick veterans. The reduction comes about by virtue of the fact that the training programs are gradually getting lower and lower. We still have a remnant of the 52-20 group, but that will be wound up, too, very soon.

Another big item is the Atomic Energy Commission. They requested about

\$1,200,000,000. We have required a reduction of nearly \$70,000,000 and I think they could stand a little further reduction, but it is a very vital agency and we hope they will economize. The Atomic Energy Commission is made up of grand, patriotic men. They have a difficult job. I do not want to minimize their effort. They are surrounded with secrecy and it may be sometimes that the secrecy detracts from their efficiency rather than adding to it, but, still, they must obey the secrecy rules written into the act. I think they do, by and large, a good job but we do hope they will watch their construction costs. They are spending more money than anybody in the Government for construction outside of the armed services.

The other big item is the Civil Service Commission. Of course, the lion's share of that is for an item, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] well knows, we cannot do very much about. That is the retirement fund for civil-service employees. However, we did reduce that \$20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee brings this bill to the floor with considerable pride in its accomplishments, in which pride the minority concurs, at least in the attempted accomplishment of keeping down the expenses of Government from year to year. As you follow the suggestions of the gentleman from Texas and look at the requests and the cuts which appear in the back of the report you will find we have done what I think should be considered a credible job. I think also I should say that we take considerable pride in our chairman. We have a chairman who has the ability to grasp and to retain in very great detail the figures which are brought before us in the justifications. I doubt if many of you know that this particular subcommittee has the budget requests of 35 agencies of Government, each having a separate objective and, therefore, a separate type of work, and that, in addition to all the material presented to us in the original bound document, we have a supplementary pile of justifications in mimeographed or typed form which would extend that high from the table. It is a very arduous job, it is a job which takes practically all of the time of the Members from the middle of January until we come to the floor of the House with the bill.

It has been a pleasure for me to work on the subcommittee in the 5 years that I have been there; first under the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH] and now under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and with the other Members on both sides, minority and majority, and with two very cooperative and able members of the staff, William Duvall and Homer Skarin. I think you should share our entitlement to a certain amount of pride in the results when you compare the figures which we set up for this year in the bill with the requests made by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am, however, more and more firmly convinced as the days go by that this is not the entire comparison we should make, and if we are to do anything about the rising costs of Government and the rising centralization of power, we have to make other comparisons of figures. Therefore, if you were to take the expenditures of the departments and agencies, the costs to the taxpayers for the year 1939, and then take them for the year 1947, if you wish, as I have them on this sheet, and then the requests which those agencies made for fiscal year 1952, and then, of course, the fourth column would be the amount that we have allowed them out of those requests, you would be somewhat concerned as I am somewhat concerned. The Civil Service Commission, of which the gentleman from Texas just spoke and with which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is personally familiar, had an appropriation of \$78,000,000 in 1939. In 1947 that had jumped to \$236,500,000, and for the current year the Commission asked for \$343,000,000, and we allowed them \$321,000,000. That is an increase of 339 percent in the 12-year period and an increase in the 5-year period of 45 percent. The Federal Power Commission jumped from \$1,900,000 to \$3,735,000 and in 5 years to \$4,338,600. The recent 5 years is the comparison we should make, because that is the post-war comparison. That is the period in which the present occupant of the White House has been the President of the United States, and he was the post-war President. I have not included in these figures the figures for the war periods except as they might have jumped from prewar to the immediate post-war period.

Next is the Federal Trade Commission which jumped from 2.1 millions to 2.8 between 1937 and 1947 and then jumped a cool million in the last 5 years.

General Services Administration is difficult to figure, because it is a combination of other agencies. I have attempted in this analysis to take those agencies which are now in the General Services Administration and show that those same agencies in 1939 received \$480,000,000; in 1947 they had jumped only to \$578,000,000, but in the intervening 5 years they have jumped to \$1,650,000,000, which is an increase in 5 years of 244 percent. So, you go on down, and if any of you have any special interests I will be very glad to tell you the figures. These are only in our subcommittee bill, and outside of that you have the same thing. Federal Security jumped from \$758 million to \$928 million and then in 5 years made an enormous jump to \$2,154,483,011. Commerce jumped from \$239,000,000 in 8 years to \$368,000,000, and then doubled to \$761,000,000, a 218 percent jump. This does not include the Atomic Energy Commission, and I have not included the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, both of which are defense items.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to explain

the item on page 37 regarding strategic and critical materials. Have they been eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, they were not eliminated. They came up and got the money in advance of this bill. They received from us last year \$3,038,548,370. Presently they have on hand \$1,623,543,734. We are very sensitive on the subject of strategic material and have never denied them any money.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is a very able member of that subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I did not think that they had abandoned the efforts that they are making.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They are not abandoning them. The gentleman need have no concern. We are glad to follow the advice of his subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to a proviso that has already been referred to, on page 45 of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman permit me to finish the thought I was just concluding and then come back to that and answer the question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will be very glad to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Before I am questioned on other matters, my thought is that we have come to a place in the history of the Congress when we must recognize that something more must be done to save the integrity of the dollar, to save the economy of the United States, than just a nominal cut in the requests which come to us from the President through the Bureau of the Budget. As I see it, that can be done only in some three or four ways, other than we are doing now.

The first of those ways obviously is to improve the procedures of government. There is no excuse in the world for asking for 450,000 additional employees, as I read in the paper the other day, until we have exhausted every possibility of improving the procedures of domestic government so the same number of people can do a greater amount of work.

As I remarked, to the surprise of some of my colleagues in the full committee when this was brought up, it so happens that this is a very personal matter with me. For a year and a half in World War I, I was on duty in the Ordnance Department, attempting to change the procedures of that department in such a way that the same number of people could do an increasing amount of work. You see how old-fashioned we were. This year we would have rushed up to the Appropriations Committee and asked for 10,000 additional employees. But we did not know that was the thing to do. We thought then it was the desirable and economic thing to use the same number of people to a greater possible usefulness.

The second thing we can do is being partly done, but it can be carried out more broadly; that is, if this is a war emergency, we should not confine our-

selves still to the 40-hour week. Just a 44-hour week would make unnecessary about 5 percent of the people who are currently being asked for.

There is a third thing we can do. I shall offer one amendment, when the bill is read for amendment tomorrow, which will test the desire of the House for economy by lifting out from the Federal Government a complete function, a very minor function, a very simple little function which involves only \$150,000, but a function which is a recognized duplication of work presently being done better and more economically in every State of the United States.

Finally, we should say, I think, to all the States of the United States, "We are \$257,000,000,000 in the red. Every one of you is boasting that you have money in your treasury." My State has announced to the world that it will finish this fiscal year with \$51,000,000 surplus. So there is absolutely no excuse for the States' coming to us, even under normal circumstances, and asking us to pay for things which from time immemorial have been done by the States or have been done by business or have been done by individuals. This is not a normal time. This is an emergency, when the children in the family must assume some of the obligations and the debts and the expenses of the parents, who are so deeply in debt. That, I think, we must put across to our own States first, and we may as well begin now.

Those are things that I do want the House to think about.

Now, may I come back to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to the proviso on page 45 of the bill, which limits the payment of operating subsidies to not exceeding 1,450 voyages, including the number of voyages under contracts hereafter awarded.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There has been a great deal of discussion about that. I think there is argument on both sides. The committee feels that that number should not be in excess of the actual number of voyages which will be undertaken, and therefore for which an operating subsidy will be required.

The gentleman will remember that I, myself, was on the floor a year ago in behalf of the inclusion of vessels which had filed applications for voyages, but those applications had not yet been acted upon. I still feel the same way. I am hopeful that before we come to this in the bill an exact figure may be obtainable which will tell us whether or not 1,450 is correct.

That was the figure this committee had to work. The figure of 1,434 voyages were given us as the voyages contemplated during the current fiscal year. The committee raised that to 1,450. If there is a technical point involved that that money may not be used for these not-yet-contracted voyages, then I think we should learn that and make some correction of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice on page 1464 of the hearings, pursuant to the request made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] of Admiral Cochran, a table indicating that there

is contemplated an average number of voyages to the number of 1,523 in the fiscal year 1952; and that if applications pending but not included in the fiscal 1952 budget be considered, there would appear to be another 300 voyages in the picture. Does not the gentleman think that the number of voyages provided for in the bill should be increased?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is a possibility and I think the gentleman's point is worth exploring. All I can say at the moment is that some very distinguished members of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce are presently being quoted with differing figures and we should determine that before tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that there was a situation there to correct and on which he proposed to offer an amendment, but I do not think he specified just what portion of the bill was involved.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was going to indicate that when I offered the amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. At the bottom of page 37 of the report appear two items with a minus sign before them. One is for the Federal court building in the District of Columbia, and the other for the General Accounting Office building. Do I understand from reading those figures that both of those buildings have now been completed and that no further money is needed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is "Yes." The distinguished gentleman from Michigan has a natural interest in these outstanding public buildings. The authorizations came from the Committee on Public Works, in the session when he served as its chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to join with my colleague on the subcommittee, the ranking member, Mr. PHILLIPS, in paying a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

This was the first chance I had to observe the chairman of our subcommittee in action. I was constantly amazed by the experience, the perspicacity, and the complete knowledge and thorough understanding with which the gentleman from Texas attacked the problem before us of obtaining the facts with reference to the justification for appropriations of the 35 agencies appearing before our subcommittee. As the gentleman from California pointed out, the justifications presented to our subcommittee, if laid end to end, would stack up about 5 feet from the floor, and the gentleman from Texas painstakingly and diligently analyzed each of those appropriations so that when testimony was taken, he was thoroughly conversant with the material and able to

direct the examination in order that maximum benefit could be derived.

I want also to thank very much the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and Mr. PHILLIPS for their cooperation and friendship in making the difficult job of understanding the appropriations not as difficult and not as complex as it would otherwise have been, and I know that Mr. COUDERT, of New York, and Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire, who like myself were newcomers to the committee, share my viewpoint on this.

On the whole, there was basic agreement between the members of our subcommittee on the appropriations. There were some differences, and rather sharp differences. I personally disagreed with the other members of the subcommittee on the appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I disagreed with the members of the subcommittee with respect to the appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for another, and there were other differences, as there are bound to be in an appropriation bill of this size.

For the first time, our subcommittee went into a new question, the question as to whether or not there should be charges and fees made by regulatory agencies of the Government for many of the services which they render to those who come within their jurisdiction. One of the great problems that faces our country is the difficulty of the regulatory commissions to cope with the complexities of our growing industrialized society, to deal with the regulatory problems for which they were created and with which they are confronted. A realistic appraisal of their function requires increased appropriations, because their problems and difficulties grow as our economy grows. As an example I cite the Federal Communications Commission. The Federal Communications Commission grants franchises, licenses, certificates of convenience and necessity, if you will, to all broadcasting stations upon application for such licenses, franchises, and certificates. The Commission undertakes extensive hearings first in connection with a construction permit; secondly on the question as to the allocation of the position of a particular broadcaster in the spectrum of megacycles over which the Federal Communications Commission has control. That is a pretty difficult job and a complicated job, and entails extensive hearings by the Federal Communications Commission. The taxpayers pay every dollar of the charges and of the costs that go into that hearing. The companies pay nothing, other than taxes, and I think it is only fair that in exchange for the franchise that the Government gives the broadcasting company and the protection which the Government affords to such broadcasting company to assure its freedom from interference in the operation of its broadcasting facilities in the particular point of the spectrum which it occupies, that it should pay some of the costs of the hearings. It is perfectly proper that the franchised company make a profit, and there has been much profit making. Such companies should

assume a greater share of the costs, because regulation is necessary. I think also that the Government should be able to recapture some of the costs that go into the hearings of the other regulatory agencies. Such fees are appropriate for many of the hearings which take place before the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know that in my home city of Chicago the city requires the owner of every building which operates a passenger elevator to obtain a license for that elevator, and in order to recoup the costs for inspection in such licensing it requires a rather nominal license fee.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is required to inspect locomotives of railroads, safety appliances, signaling systems, various facilities of that type. The Government pays every cent for this operation. In addition to that, much of the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission is involved with hearings on applications for certificates of convenience and necessity for bus lines and other common carriers. The Government assumes the complete cost of such hearings in spite of the fact that here again it grants a franchise which is very valuable to the company making the application, and in the operation of which franchise it is protected from competition.

Each of the Commissioners who appeared before us was asked his opinion as to whether or not it was feasible to charge for a portion of the operations of the agency, and in each event the Commissioner thought that it would be practicable. Not only that, one Commissioner expressed the viewpoint that such a practice would not only be feasible, but would deter and do away with many superfluous applications. Therefore, the subcommittee in its deliberations decided to put a new legislative section into the bill which would permit each of the agencies to appraise its own operations to see whether or not it would be possible to recapture for the Government some of the costs that the Government incurs in connection with this regulation through the establishment of a schedule of fees.

The second point that I would like to discuss is the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I have no quarrel with the appropriation as such, but my disagreement with the others on the subcommittee relates to the portion of the report which states that the item of \$25,000 for an index of the concentration of wealth has been stricken from the bill. I do not know what effect that statement in the report has. I do not believe it is legally controlling upon the Commission, but I believe that if the Commission disregarded it, it would be criticized, to say the least. I believe it is extremely important, particularly at this time when we are moving into a period of rearmament that we know the direction in which industry is moving in this country. Is there increasing monopoly growth? How much? We know that in the last war, in World War II, the Government concentrated the awarding of the major portion of its

prime contracts in the hands of relatively few big businesses, and I think that the work of the Federal Trade Commission at that time in bringing forward the facts showing the number of contracts that went to big business, the number of contracts that went to small business, the direction in which industry in this country was moving, was a very valuable survey. I think that now as we move into this period of rearmament, as we appropriate billions and billions of dollars which will go into the industrial output, into the industrial building up of this Nation, it is necessary for us to know where that money is going. We must have facts in this Congress if we are to legislate intelligently. The Federal Trade Commission is responsible for presenting us with facts on monopoly growth, and if we refuse to give them funds with which to do our work, we are not only being recreant, but foolhardy. It is necessary for us to be able to determine whether big business is snuffing out competition, to determine whether small business is destined to be excluded entirely from the economy of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, all of us agree that the greatest weapon we have in our fight against an enemy and against communism is the industrial potential of this country. To my mind one of the most vital parts of that industrial potential is the tremendous number of small businesses that are scattered throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. If we find that more and more Government business is being channelled into big business, and that just cannot be avoided, small business will fall by the wayside and, to use a phrase of the Senate Small Business Committee, our pathway will be strewn with their corporate corpses.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I came in touch with this problem that the gentleman is talking about when we drafted the termination of war contracts bill. In the last war out in my area we had the small businesses out there form pools in the city of Stockton and in the city of Sacramento and they would handle the business for 8, 10, or 15 companies. We must take the latent ability, experience, and ingenuity of these small businesses and use it. Some of the small-business men are the smartest businessmen in the country although they do not make the most money.

I want to mention one instance. I was out in Chicago looking into the termination of war contracts in connection with the Ordnance Division out there and I found a little man from St. Paul who started with 40 employees. At the end of the war when we talked to him he was trying to terminate contracts and paying a \$12,000,000 income-tax return. So it shows what can be done by small

business if it is properly organized and given the right kind of work to do.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said and I thank him for the statement.

The point I am making, and I plead it with utmost earnestness, is that it is vitally important that we know what the condition of big business and small business is in this country. We must have facts. It is necessary that we be able to trace any concentration of wealth toward monopoly because unless we do that we have no basis upon which to draft legislation in this Congress and we have no basis upon which to protect the small business of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. I concur heartily in what the gentleman has said. We want to find out if there is a concentration of wealth and we ought to know the tendency and the direction it is going.

Mr. YATES. Of course, we have to have those facts. Here we are appropriating in excess of \$6,000,000,000 in the pending bill. Twenty-five thousand dollars is all that will be required to permit the Federal Trade Commission to continue with its study of the concentration of wealth in this country. In my opinion, it would be foolhardy, it would be false economy, if we did not permit that agency to continue that study at this particular time.

Let me cite in support of my point what the Hoover Commission has said on what should be the proper function of the Federal Trade Commission. It is directed right to this particular point:

In addition, the Federal Trade Commission can and should constitute a reservoir of information on the structure of the economy and of specific industries. This information should be available to the antitrust agencies and to other Government agencies, such as those concerned with defense. By its reports to Congress and the public, the Commission should keep them abreast of changes in the structure of the economy and aware of needed legislative action.

Mr. Chairman, that is an eminently correct statement. Only the Federal Trade Commission can make a survey of this type; there is no other agency in the Government that can undertake it.

Relationship of actual contributions to contract contributions, United States Housing Act program

Fiscal year—	Public Law 412			Public Law 671			Total		
	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Per-cent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Per-cent	A/C paid	Contract A/C	Per-cent
1940.....									
1941.....	\$4,747,176	\$4,747,176	100.0				\$4,747,176	\$4,747,176	100.0
1942.....	9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2				9,925,891	11,258,951	88.2
1943.....	9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7				9,882,882	13,049,252	75.7
1944.....	10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2				10,129,997	14,436,885	70.2
1945.....	8,681,923	14,477,969	60.0	\$40,377	\$6,615,569	0.6	8,722,300	21,093,538	41.4
1946.....	7,091,344	14,501,979	48.9	45,391	6,615,569	.7	7,136,735	21,117,548	33.8
1947.....	5,612,387	14,509,187	38.7	54,243	6,615,569	.8	5,666,630	21,124,756	26.8
1948.....	3,810,872	14,519,550	26.2	129,533	6,615,569	2.0	3,940,405	21,135,119	18.6
1949.....	3,842,417	14,770,515	26.0	452,663	6,615,569	6.8	4,295,080	21,386,084	20.1
1950.....	5,839,040	14,855,753	39.3	679,692	6,615,569	10.3	6,518,732	21,471,322	30.4
1951 (estimate).....	6,348,921	14,855,753	42.7	1,151,079	6,615,569	17.4	7,500,000	21,471,322	34.9
Total.....	75,912,850	145,982,970	52.0	2,552,978	46,308,983	5.5	78,465,828	192,291,953	40.8

¹ Includes retroactive pilot as provided by Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171).

This shows no payment of the maximum contributions, and I hold that these figures are indicative as to what the con-

tributions would be under the Housing Act of 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut the number of units to 75,000 rather

Every agency in the Government is required to file an annual report, but there is no central agency that I know of, with the exception of the Federal Trade Commission, that can collate this material, that can join it together, so that we in the Congress may be made aware of the direction of business growth in this country.

My other major point of disagreement with the other members of the subcommittee is in connection with the provisions relating to the Public Housing Administration.

Under the terms of the Housing Act of 1949 the Public Housing Administration was given the responsibility of constructing 135,000 units per year. In view of restrictions on building materials, in view of the demands for the use of building materials for defense purposes, the Bureau of the Budget cut that number to 75,000 units. I insist there is no justification in the hearings which warrant a further cut; however, this subcommittee arbitrarily and without reason cut the number of these units to 50,000. What this does, in my opinion, is to upset the schedule for public housing in all cities throughout the country, and every metropolitan community desperately needs housing.

The chairman stated, and I think his statement was accurate as far as it went, that under the Public Housing Act of 1949, in the event that all of the 810,000 are constructed, there might be a maximum contribution demanded of the Federal Government of \$320,000,000 per year. That would assume, however, that all of the units provided for under the Housing Act of 1949 were constructed before that maximum guaranty went into effect. That is the maximum amount which the Federal Government would be required to pay under any consideration. But let us look at the facts. The Chairman's statement should be compared with actual facts relating to the Housing Act of 1937 under which the Federal Government also was required to make a similar contribution. Under previous Federal housing acts the actual contributions of the Federal Government were as follows:

than 135,000. That in itself cut the amount of contributions from the maximum amount, so that we know that under no possible interpretation would the Federal Government ever be compelled to pay the maximum amount to which the chairman referred in his principal address.

Leaving that point, I would like to ask for clarification of page 58 of the bill, and I should like to have the viewpoint of the chairman on this. Line 16 refers to an amount of \$33,000,000 and is a part of a proviso which says:

That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed \$33,000,000.

What does that item refer to? Does it refer to the actual operating expenses of the Public Housing Administration?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that this expense is broken down into two parts: administrative and nonadministrative. The administrative expense is that expense that is incurred primarily for salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia. The items that are pointed out on line 16 amounting to \$33,000,000 is what we call the nonadministrative expenses. That is all of those operating costs that are incurred in the field, plus interest, and so forth, and so on. We were advised this morning that the figure of \$33,000,000, nonadministrative expense, is an error; that it is about \$15,000,000 more, making a total of approximately \$49,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses. But those are the items covered in that figure.

Mr. YATES. In other words, the items included within this appropriation are the items for direct operations, site inspections, and direct disposition expenses. Certainly it is not intended to include, for instance, amounts necessary for funded expenses.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. What we have done, as the gentleman well knows, since they are spending in 1952 not \$33,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses but possibly \$49,000,000, the committee has requested them in the future to break that expense down and submit it to the committee so that we can pass judgment on it and in turn submit it to the House for its judgment and consideration. That has not been done in the past.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman. I certainly hope that the 25,000 units that were cut from the act by the action of the subcommittee will be restored. I know that as we move into this war period, housing in my own city of Chicago is becoming critically more and more in short supply. The buildings that have been built under section 608 of the housing law have not provided the type of dwellings necessary for the war workers, for those who are employees and laborers in the defense plants. I think it is vitally essential; I think it is fundamental that the housing program should be permitted to continue so that as workers move into defense areas like Chicago there will be some provision

made for housing them. Already overcrowded, teeming cities cannot absorb additional workers without more housing accommodations.

I should like to refer the attention of the House to the committee hearings. Look at pages 1769 and the following and read what Rev. Thomas B. Keehn of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, and Rt. Rev. John A. O'Grady of the National Conference of Catholic Charities had to say when they appeared before the subcommittee. They pointed out the dire necessity for continuing the housing program at this critical time. Buildings are getting more and more crowded. They need rehabilitation. Slums are growing. The only thing we can do is keep up with the evergrowing problem. I hope that when we come to a consideration of this point the House will see fit to restore the additional units that are needed.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any group of men in whom I have greater confidence than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and his subcommittee, who have brought this bill before us. I am confident that feeling is generally shared here.

I have just listened, as you have, to an able statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I was particularly impressed with him as a new member of this great committee. He talked with wisdom, he showed a soundness and thoroughness and a conscientious approach that anyone could be proud to show. It does not follow that I necessarily agree with all the points that he raised, but I am profoundly impressed with him as one of my colleagues in this House.

I rise to discuss with complete frankness the increase in the amount of money proposed for allocation to the White House offices. I am not going to offer an amendment on this subject, but I do want to focus attention on it. In fiscal 1951 the White House offices received an appropriation of \$1,585,000, whereas in fiscal 1952 it is proposed that they receive \$1,883,000, an increase of \$300,000.

Three hundred thousand dollars is not a lot of money as we think of money and as we appropriate it nowadays, but a \$300,000 increase in this item is 20 percent more than was appropriated last year for the same purpose. It provides for 35 additional employees in fiscal 1952, more travel money, and more odds and ends of expenses, where we had hoped to see savings. If you break it down to a per capita basis, it means that this is going to take the tax payments of many persons each year for this one item of increased cost of Government.

The record shows it was passed over by the committee without a great deal of discussion or comment, I presume largely out of respect for the office of President of the United States. I do not quarrel with that. I think it is understandable. But I want to point out, Mr. Chairman,

that the President himself stated in his budget message to Congress:

In order that our resources can be diverted to meet the demands of national security, strict economy in nondefense spending is required.

I have seen nothing in the justifications to indicate that the increase proposed in this item is dictated by considerations of national security or defense, or that it would even operate to relieve the President of any of the tremendous burden which we know he must personally carry.

In the great effort to achieve economy which the Committee on Appropriations and the House as a whole is making this year, we should not consider the White House staff or the Congress or any other agency of Government as exempt from efforts to economize. Instead, the head of the Government should lead and should set a pattern to hold down costs in every possible way.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is much merit to the suggestion of the gentleman from Florida in the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee, but does not the gentleman realize with what reluctance a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations would recommend cuts in the staff of the office of the President? Is it not on all fours with the institution of cuts in the expenses of the other body by a House committee?

Mr. SIKES. I think I pointed out, as I went along, that I recognize it is difficult for one of us in the House of Representatives to overcome our reluctance to point a finger at an office that we respect as greatly as we respect the office of the President and it is with reluctance that we point a finger at the Senate and say "We find it necessary that we tell you how much money you can use or should use to run your own personal business." While it is difficult for us to do that, we at the same time are not prevented from saying, "We urge in greatest sincerity that you, Mr. President, and you, the Senate, as well as we, the House of Representatives, make every effort that can properly be made to hold down expenses."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman very highly on the observations that he has made. I hope he offers an amendment to trim those added expenses from the President's budget. Certainly he ought to be held to what he had last year and perhaps cut some from that. He has been doing a lot of talking about belt tightening and sacrifices. He should share in it, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable now to the gentleman from Alabama, I will yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG]. I believe the gentleman has consented also to yield 10 minutes to him. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman,

that the gentleman may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the kindness of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama in yielding this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have been attempting to make this brief report on my trip to the Far East since my return some 2 weeks ago, when the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, and I returned after visiting Japan, Korea, Formosa, and other points in what I might term a "spirit of bipartisan cooperation." The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I made the trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens. We were privileged to inspect most of our military installations in Japan and to visit the bases, camps, and the fighting front of the Korean war. We made an intense and earnest study of the conditions and problems confronting our commanders, our troops, our sources of supply, and civilian activities in that troubled area of the world.

My distinguished colleague from South Carolina is a veteran of World War II, while I am a veteran of World War I. We hoped that we might find and bring back to our colleagues in the House of Representatives such information and reports as would be helpful to all of us, whether in the majority or in the minority. We hoped to help shape the course of legislation for the defense of the free world. I am happy here to say that no one could have devoted himself more wholeheartedly to this task than the honorable young Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I hope that he, too, may soon have time to make a report on his observations.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are agreed on the danger that we face, and with the realization of what is before us there can be no partisanship. I am concerned that in the discussion of foreign affairs there shall be no partisan words. My party has a duty to perform in offering constructive criticism and the majority party has a duty to perform in offering leadership and in accepting constructive criticism when it is due. But we are certainly united in our desire to win this war in Korea as quickly as possible with the loss of as few lives as possible. On that score there can be no debate. There can be differences of opinion in regard to the proper method of winning the war as quickly as possible. We have been hearing some of those differences of opinion. But we are united, whether of the majority or minority, in the spirit of helpfulness to all of the people of our country. I emphasize that because I have been asked why this member of the majority party and I made a trip as individual Congressmen and American citizens without committee authorization and paying our own way. I say to you that we did it for the same reason that any of you would, in order to try to find

the answer to some of these grave problems confronting us in the Far East.

I believe my distinguished colleague will back me up in reporting that the Korean engagement has demonstrated the success of the unification of our armed services. There are still many problems to be worked out, of course; but we contacted many of the commanders of our land troops, of the Marines, of our naval forces, and most frequently those commanders who were our hosts on this trip, the Air Force. Everywhere we asked the question in regard to how unification was working. Everywhere we received the same answer, that our armed services are now working as an efficient team. That team is well coordinated in combat as well as in the supplying of ammunition and other materials of war, and in all operations necessary to such an engagement as that in Korea.

There is an unfavorable note, however, and I report it to you frankly. As we talked to the commanders in Japan and then in Korea, we sensed a very grave feeling of unreality. We had the opportunity of talking to General MacArthur, then the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers. Right on the battle line we had the very unique privilege of talking to the commander in Korea, General Ridgway, General Stratemeyer of the Air Force was our host. We talked to many others, I would say 50 of the high-ranking officers of all of the armed services. Not only that, we talked also to the high-ranking commanders and officers of our brave allies, including the British, the general commanding the Turkish troops, the leaders of the French, Canadian, and Australian forces, and so on. We talked to officers and men of most of the United Nations who are fighting with us, even though some of them have only token forces in Korea. Everywhere we received the information that there was a feeling of unreality on the part of the troops because of the handicap under which they are fighting this war in that they have not been permitted to attack the bases of enemy supply, their communication and transportation lines. They told us that this was the first war in history where men fighting in the field were denied this primary action necessary to victory.

Let me leave that for just a moment to present this map of the Far East. First I shall mention Formosa, since this island is very much in the minds of our military leaders at the present time. I am sure its strategic importance has been discussed by the distinguished members of our Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees. Formosa lies right in what we might term our line of defense in the Far East which extends from Japan down this chain of islands to Formosa lying off the coast of China, on down through various islands to those of the South Pacific, to Australia, and New Zealand. It is obvious that if that line were broken at any point, all the other points of the line would be jeopardized. That is why General MacArthur in appearing before the Congress emphasized what he considered to be the strategic importance of Formosa. I may

say that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and I sitting before him just a few days before he was relieved of his duties, heard him say what he later said to the Congress, except he expressed it to us in more emphatic terms.

General MacArthur said that some of our allies are not united with us on the importance of Formosa, referring doubtless to the fact that the British Government has proposed that it be turned over to the Red Chinese. He said, "Formosa is of such importance that we cannot lose it without jeopardizing Japan, the Philippine Islands, and even Australia." Formosa commands a strategic spot for Indochina and for all of the rest of the Far East. That certainly is true.

Let us then consider what we have on Formosa by way of potential allied strength. Bear in mind that China, meaning, of course, free China—anti-Communist China—is not only our ally, but also a member of the United Nations. Not only is free China a member of the United Nations but it is a permanent member of the Security Council entrusted with the major responsibility for the peace of the entire world. After that tragic march of the Communists down across China beginning about 18 months ago and culminating in the defeat of the troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the loyal troops fled to this island of Formosa. There they have been what might be called bottled up, due to policies not fully explained.

When the Korean engagement began the generalissimo and his staff offered to the United Nations a force of 30,000 men. He said, "Let us stand with your troops in the fight for freedom." That offer was refused. Every offer he has made since that time has been refused.

So I wanted to look into the matter of how much strength there might be there available to be utilized in the defense of the free world. I regarded that as important. My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], could not go to Formosa, but I went there and spent nearly a week. I was shown every courtesy by our American civilian and military authorities, and, of course, by the Chinese Government and its military commanders. It was my happy privilege to have dinner with Generalissimo and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. For several days I rode by plane, in jeeps and trucks, to inspect with my own eyes the strength of the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa. I had heard speculation in regard to how much strength there might be there and as to whether or not it would be effective in warfare. I think I can report to you a fairly accurate figure because I checked not only with the staff of the Nationalist Chinese forces but also with members of our very small military mission in Taipei, the capital.

The Nationalist Chinese have 360,000 effective fighting men now on Formosa. It is true that these men would need a great deal of conditioning. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I asked General MacArthur what would be the need before the forces on

Formosa could be utilized. We asked him what would be their needs that must be made available and for which we in the Congress might be responsible. General MacArthur's answer to us was the same as the answer of retired General Chennault and many others we consulted.

First of all, the Chinese Nationalists need equipment. The planes that I inspected on their air fields were those we gave them during the recent war or not later than 1946. The equipment they have is pitifully small because so much has been denied them. For most of one day I was the guest of their naval leaders. I conferred with their admiral and his staff. I inspected nearly all of their ships in harbor. The biggest ships they have are the two destroyers we gave them. They have a lot of little ships. There in the distance was a row of Japanese ships which we captured and which we could turn over to them but which have been denied them.

The free Chinese are ready and eager to accept new equipment, new armament, new ammunition, new airplanes that they must have if they are going to help us in this fight. I was astounded to find that because of an edict—I do not know who issued it—perhaps the Armed Forces Committee would know—on many ships were vacant spaces where guns should be. The biggest naval guns they are allowed to have are 3-inch guns. I wish I knew why. Their commanders could not answer the question. They just smiled when I asked them why. Everywhere I found they were restricted.

They need equipment. Then they need supervision. We must take action pretty soon to equip these forces to fight for freedom, for us and for themselves. But we must not make the mistake that obviously was made and which some of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's military men told me in confidence, of turning the equipment over to them without proper American supervision. They will welcome that supervision. Lots of that equipment we sent them before undeniably was lost to the Communists. Perhaps some of it was even sold to them. But what the free Chinese want is a strong military mission in Formosa, not just a few hundred men, but something perhaps on the order of 1,500. Then let us equip them so that they will be ready to take their place with us.

What then should the plan be? Some would deny the use of these Nationalist troops, they fear that would involve us in a war with Red China. I respectfully call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that we are already at war with Red China. Communist China has by its aggression declared war upon us. Now if we are going to admit the help of the Nationalist Chinese, let us face the fact that we are at war and let us plan accordingly. But let us not—I emphasize not—send out our land troops into the mainland of China. These Nationalists say, "If you give us the equipment and the supervision, we will do the job ourselves without calling upon a single American soldier."

Now, the plan contemplates five things.

First, not an invasion off Formosa, but down at the little island of Hainan,

which the Japanese seized early in the recent war and from which they began their excursions northward upon the south part of China. That is exactly the tactics that should now be used, say the military men, American and Chinese, because Hainan is only just a few miles away from the mainland. Furthermore, the southern part of China is filled with guerrillas ready to spring to arms if they can get arms and to help bring the downfall of the Red regime in China. We could help them seize Hainan quite easily now, despite the fact that the Russians within the last few weeks have begun the building of five different military installations on the island. They could not hold Hainan under a devastating attack.

Second, let them make their invasion from there with the help of guerrillas.

Third, and this is tremendously important, we should blockade the entire Chinese coast.

Fourth, we must bomb the enemy bases in Manchuria. Mr. DORN and I asked General Ridgway his opinion. I would not want to quote by name any other military man for obvious reasons, but out of the 50 or more high-ranking officers of all the branches of the service which we queried on the matter, everyone gave the same answer as General Ridgway: "We do not consider it possible to end the Korean war in victory under the handicap of not being able to strike the enemy where he is." One commander went so far as to say we could have prevented the building up of the forces in North Korea, which are now engaged in this offensive, simply by bombing not the Manchurian people, not the people of China, but the enemy military targets. There are five railroad lines coming into Mukden, the capital of Manchuria. There are transportation lines spanning down to the Yalu River. If we could bomb those military strategic targets and then follow up by the bombing of the supply line that comes down the Chinese coast, we would halt the march of the Red Chinese from the mainland into Manchuria and from Manchuria into Korea. What stands in the way of that, I ask you?

Here I turn to a report that was given me by the intelligence officers of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's army and I have excerpts from it. A part of this is my own opinion to go along with it. But I learned that the British Government stands in the way of putting into effect a plan that would permit us to end this Korean war in victory. The British Government has actually furnished the two items necessary either for Communist victory or at best a stalemate. First, they have given assurance that the Red bases and supply lines will not be bombed with their consent. Second, strategic materials needed for the conduct of the war have flown in a steady stream through Hong Kong and into China and Russia. From these intelligence sources, both Chinese and United States, I was informed in Taipei that the Russians are supervising the construction of an atomic bomb plant in northwestern China, and that much of the strategic material needed for this plant came into China through British hands

during the last 3 years. Since the war in Korea began, imports of all sorts of implements and material of war, such as transportation equipment, rubber, steel, and other metals, airplane engines and parts and machine tools have poured in a steady stream through British Hong Kong for use by the Chinese Reds or by the Soviet Union itself.

A naval blockade by the United States, with the British helping us, if they will, and any other fighting ships made available by members of the United Nations, is imperative if we are to win the war in Korea. With the cooperation of the British, if they decide to cooperate fully, and by blockading the Chinese coast, by bombing the Chinese military bases and supply lines, and by the use of the Nationalist forces when they are equipped and prepared to join us in the struggle, I say to you, and I measure my words again, Communist China could be quickly defeated and the war in the Far East ended. Soviet Russia would not intervene at the present time. That is the almost unanimous opinion of all the military men we talked to.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is making an extremely important contribution, for which I am sure he ought to be applauded by all the Members of the House.

The gentleman's reference to the Chinese Nationalist forces landing forces on the mainland of China is extremely interesting. I wonder if the gentleman recalls that in World War II, in order to help the Chinese forces the American Navy did exactly that same thing, which could now be done by the Chinese Nationalists. The project was at that time secret, called "Miss X," under which only a few well-equipped Navy officers were dropped by parachute into the hinterland and on the island of Hainan, which the gentleman mentioned, and there they were able to give advice and material and use certain electronic aids. They were removed from China with comparative ease and with very little loss of life. It was an easy proposition. Does not the gentleman agree it would be easier now, with the light control with which China is held by the Reds, than it was in World War II?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I ask the gentleman one more question: I also have had the privilege of talking with General MacArthur, on two occasions, the last one in September. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that from every officer or GI with whom he talked there was complete disagreement with the idea of a limited war which would prevent us from using the military means at our command to bomb enemy bases across the river?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that not only was the opinion unanimous, but when you get down to the level of the GI I can assure the gentleman that it is very bitter. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DORN]

and I talked to men who were climbing out of their planes after bombing raids. We talked to five airmen just returned from flying their jet-fighter planes up to the Yalu River. If you want to hear bitter talk, hear them comment on the fact that they must fly up there and wait for the enemy. They cannot attack the enemy base. They watch the Russian-made planes rise to the attack, come across that river from the sanctuary, shoot down our planes and retreat behind the sanctuary where they cannot be pursued.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I conclude with this comment: I had exactly the same experience myself, even to the point where some of the GI's would say to me, "Who is this guy Acheson, anyway?" When I undertook to tell them, they would look at me and say, "Well, is he on our side?" I wondered whether the gentleman had some such experience.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that the information secured on Formosa was to the effect that our American officers would have supervision at all times of any action that might be taken by Chiang Kai-shek? Was that what the gentleman found out there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman that the opinion I gained was that that supervision should be given in immediate training of those troops, in air power particularly, because to my way of thinking air power is of greatest importance in this war.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman spoke of guerrillas on the mainland ready to come to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek's forces. It is my information that throughout the mainland of China, now overrun by the Communists, Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of strength, and that if he should be permitted to return to the mainland with any degree of support on our part manifested, millions of Chinese now under Communist domination would rally to his side. Has the gentleman any information on that or any opinion about it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is my opinion that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is still the symbol of the leadership of free China. I would not want to say that he should remain the leader forever, but at present he has the confidence of his people.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. DORN. May I say to the gentleman. I think he is making a very interesting contribution. I would like to say this, it is true that they have probably 1,500,000 Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland of China. But if we follow our present pro-Socialistic policy, these guerrillas will be liquidated if we have a truce in Korea, and they then will build the atomic bomb plant and in 10 or 15 years they will come back so strong that we cannot do anything about it. That is

just plain common sense. There was not one single difference of opinion in the front-line troops and the generals, all the way from private first class to General MacArthur in the Far East—there was not any difference of opinion whatsoever. This is a silly, stupid policy which has been concocted by some people that I wish I were at liberty to tell the committee about.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. It is following a policy of confusion made by confused people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman, and his observation is correct.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. LANTAFF. I commend the gentleman from Missouri on the excellent and very fair presentation that he has made. With reference to the guerrilla activity on the mainland, is it not true that there are very little if any communications existing now between those groups?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will say to the gentleman there are good communications existing. I know of one harbor which they use that the Communists have never seized. As late as 3 days ago I received, through one of their emissaries here in Washington, news directly from the mainland.

Mr. LANTAFF. How many of the guerrilla leaders, if the gentleman knows, are loyal to Chiang Kai-shek, as opposed to him?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot say, but I am sure they are all loyal to the ideal of toppling over the Red regime and winning freedom for their country.

Mr. LANTAFF. The gentleman mentioned that there have been some 30,000 troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek for use in Korea. Is it not true that all military leaders, including General MacArthur, turned down that offer because they did not want to use those troops in Korea and in the hopes that they could subsequently be used to better advantage to go back into China?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know who is entirely responsible for that policy, except to say that those troops were refused by United Nations' directive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for going to the Orient at his own expense and getting this information and presenting it so well to us today. Is this what the gentleman is saying? You are not recommending that we tie ourselves exclusively to Chiang Kai-shek or the Nationalist Government. Rather it is your concern that we get effective help to all the forces opposing our mortal enemy in China. We ought not deny ourselves the benefit of the leader who has the largest following and the most forces under his control. But at the same time, does not the gentleman agree, that we

should with imagination and vigor support every single group or force on the mainland of China which is making trouble in the rear of the Communists, seeking to make them fail in their aggressive plans, discrediting them and their whole movement in Asia and diverting some of their strength from Korea where they are killing Americans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly correct. Let me summarize the advantages of this plan: It does not require the use of American ground troops on the mainland of China. It would permit the people of free China to regain their homes and liberties. It would save countless lives that will otherwise be lost in this stalemate war in Korea. It would reverse the tide of the Communist aggression and put us on the offensive and the Kremlin on the defensive. I say to you in this closing word, that since there is no substitute for victory, we cannot stop to negotiate with these Red Chinese aggressors. We have to go ahead to victory. In China we find a people who are ready for revolution against Communist aggression. If we win back China, it would give us the first victory over communism since 1945. The courage and strength of freemen in the world are on trial today. I beg that we move quickly to give these freemen the leadership they need.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Some people are saying that if we do the things you have urged it will lead to all-out war with Communist China. Is it not rather a fact that this is the best hope we have of preventing all-out war with China; because if they win in China, they would be able to fight in the Philippines and fight in Japan and fight in Indochina, and then we would be in trouble? Whatever the risks of the proposals which the gentleman has presented, the risks of any other alternative are infinitely greater.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri has very well summarized the question that I originally intended to propound of the gentleman who is making such a fine contribution to the thinking of the Members of the House on this subject. But is not Russia and has not Russia from the very beginning been doing the things for Communist China that the gentleman from Missouri is suggesting that we do for our allies in the Pacific who are in a position to help us and without which the Communists in China never could have risen to the position of power in the Pacific?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman is correct, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I refrained from making any public comment on the Far East because 2 years ago I strongly supported Chiang Kai-shek. I reached the conclusion then that the people of China had lost confidence in him and the will to fight. I would like to ask my friend—he made reference to Hainan, and I am refraining from making statements now because I want always to look at the national interests of our country—the gentleman referred to the island of Hainan. Some several months ago Nationalist China had that island, did they not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is correct. Mr. McCORMACK. And it was captured by the Communists?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists captured the island? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry; I cannot tell.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not more than twenty or twenty-five thousand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe the Nationalist troops were ready to abandon it and move to Formosa.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they had 130,000 troops there, the Nationalists. I would like to know how many Nationalist troops there were on Hainan and how many Communist troops invaded it and captured it, this island that the gentleman named here.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think I can answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. It had been decided in about December of 1949 by the Nationalist forces in Formosa that they would withdraw from Hainan, but before they could withdraw the first Communist attack came across the little gap of water between the mainland and Hainan, and the generalissimo, so I am advised reliably, did not want to pull out immediately under pressure but withdrew gradually. His men stood off 11 attacks in the process of evacuating. When the twelfth attack came it was accompanied by the infiltration and defection of one Nationalist regiment in Hainan. It was the break-up of that regiment which brought the end.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I want to know how many Nationalist troops there were there.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman has correctly stated, about 130,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many Communists were in the attacking force?

Mr. JUDD. That is hard to say; I do not think there is any reliable information.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I remember the figure it was about 25,000.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think the gentleman can substantiate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so, but the number of Communists was con-

siderably less than the number of Nationalists; and the Communists won because the Nationalists had somehow lost the will to fight.

Mr. JUDD. And why should not they after our repeated announcements that they were finished? Originally the Nationalist troops had plenty of will to fight, but we insisted they cease fire instead. Marshall's criticism when he went over there was because they had too much will to fight. He helped destroy their will to fight, although I do not suggest he realized what he was doing. If you will help the Nationalists a little again, especially with moral support, you will find the will to fight will come back almost overnight.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise or to fall to such mundane subjects as this appropriation bill after the interesting remarks of the gentleman from Missouri on the very dramatic subject that he dealt with. Unfortunately, however, we do have to have appropriations and that means appropriation bills, and that means that some of us have to sit here and suffer through them.

Let me say at the outset as a member of this committee that I have enjoyed enormously working with this group of delightful, distinguished, and, high-minded gentlemen who compose its membership on both sides of the aisle; in fact, I may say that in the committee under the genial chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the able minority member from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the ranking Republican member, there is no aisle.

I am not going to make any attempt to review this enormous budget for 25 or 26 agencies; I want to confine myself to one single point, a point as to which this Congress, can really do something and do something constructive. Anyone who sits in a subcommittee of this character, and I think this subcommittee has the largest budget of any except the armed services which, of course, now dwarfs everything else, must feel as I do. We have had the experience of listening to the budget demands of the sacred cows, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission, and others, all of these sacred agencies vested with the aura of national defense, agencies that come in blithely, happily, uninspected and unsupervised by Congress, lay down their budgets for billions and billions of dollars and expect to have them granted and they generally are. The member who sits there and feels this flood pouring over him is in very much the same position as a man at the foot of Niagara Falls with his mouth wide open. There is nothing you can do about it. There can be no more helpless feeling.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in his remarks made a number of points directed to Members of Congress, members of State legislatures and municipalities as to what each in his particular situation can do to try to save the United States from bankruptcy

through unlimited appropriations, which lead to inflation and disaster. Here is one thing that the Members of this House can do and as to which, in my humble judgment, we have all be recreant and derelict in our duty.

All I ask is that we see to it that the committee is properly equipped and staffed to do the job that has to be done and can be done. Mind you, we could not have better men than these gentlemen who serve us as executive secretaries, such as William Duvall. There is not a better or abler man for the job, there is not a better assistant than Mr. Skaren, who works night and day on this bill, as do their associates on the other subcommittees. But, Mr. Chairman, the executive secretaries to these committees are only individuals, one or two of them, and they are not in position to investigate as should be investigated the great agencies over which we have jurisdiction.

Now, what we do, what Members of Congress do, in allowing this Appropriation Committee to face the Executive forces, so to speak, across the table, wholly unequipped, wholly disarmed, is really a dereliction of a fundamental duty; that is, to keep alive and effective the one real constitutional power remaining in our hands through which we can keep control of the Government of the United States and protect our freedom. I refer to the appropriation power. It is the fundamental power, it is the heart of our representative free system of government. We have let it fall into a very sad state, Mr. Chairman, when we let an appropriation subcommittee sit across the table without having had the benefit of a searching and comprehensive investigation of those great agencies all through the year, 12 months of the year, so that when they appear before your subcommittees the members would be armed with reports from reliable experts as to what is going on in those agencies, how efficiently they are operating, how economically, or the reverse, so that we have something to go on.

It is easy enough, perhaps, for men of usual industry and intelligence to deal with smaller agencies with a six or seven billion budget, such as the Federal Trade Commission or the Security Exchange Commission. That amount is without comprehension. That kind of operation can be reduced to a standard, to work loads and all those other criteria. But what about the Atomic Energy Commission that spends \$1,200,000,000 operating the greatest industry in the United States, spending billions and billions of dollars in great new construction work? What about the Veterans' Administration that spends five or six billion dollars in every known form of expenditure? What about the Tennessee Valley Authority that runs a great power plant, that runs navigation controls and builds dams, that is now building enormous new facilities?

Who investigates them? Who can come to us and speak as agents of the Congress and say: Here is how your money is being spent. Here is where you can save.

Mr. Chairman, in the Eightieth Congress we did begin to set up such an investigatory staff. I sat on two subcommittees where important agencies, the Veterans' Administration, Maritime Commission and Public Housing, were being considered. We had the benefit of a careful, searching 12 months' investigation right on the ground by experts who came to us and said: Gentlemen, here is the story on these agencies. This is where they are wrong, this is where they are wasting your money and the taxpayers' money. This is what might be done about it.

It gave that committee a chance to go to work. I say, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of this House should seriously consider this proposition. Everyone should insist upon providing this committee with the kind of a staff of experts that can cover all of the big agencies of Government on a 12 months' basis, so that when your subcommittee and your subcommittee members come to meet these great budget requests they will be able to do so with some semblance of intelligence.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mrs. BOSONE. I should like to say that the gentleman from New York has, to my mind, made sense out of his argument today.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOSONE. Is it not true that if we follow the gentleman's suggestion, we would not need these expensive klieg light and other special investigations? Would this not bring the facts 12 months out of the year to the people who should have them? In that way you would get at the real facts and probably save millions of dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. The distinguished gentleman said it better than I could. I think that is undoubtedly true. Particularly with the membership of this committee, you would have certainly businesslike and serious approach; kind of a continual year-round investigation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from New York. I believe he has touched on one of the greatest challenges to the survival of our free economy. Time after time I have contended congressional appropriation committees could save millions through constant surveys of Federal spending agencies by specially trained experts.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations at any time in their endeavor to save the funds of our National Treasury, and to protect the taxpayers; in fact, I am greatly interested in their efforts along that line. I think in considering the legislation that the Committee on Appropriations now offers in this

appropriation bill, some of the history of the merchant marine should be reviewed. It so happens when I became a Member of the Congress I was placed on the Merchant Marine Committee of this House, along with other Members who have left that committee and gone to the Committee on Appropriations and various other committees. If we recall the situation we found ourselves in in 1916, it would be interesting to enlarge upon it, but time does not suffice. We found ourselves in a position where we could not transport our troops abroad. We had to appeal to our allies to transport our armies and our supplies across the Atlantic Ocean. I know one man personally who went to France in a British ship, a freighter, sleeping in a hammock. The hammocks were 12 high and 12 deep. The ship had a Chinese crew and five or six British citizens for officers. During the war we built many types of ships and the question of the disposal of the war fleet after the armistice arose and there was a great controversy, and it is said and the record shows that a great scandal occurred. With that history before them the Merchant Marine Committee of the House began hearings on a bill that eventually became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, declaring that the American flag should still fly on the high seas and at least 50 percent of the commerce of the United States should be carried in American bottoms. That great Virginian, that great American who has gone on to his reward, the Honorable Otis Bland, championed this bill and brought it to perfection; perfection at that time, so the House said and so the Congress said, because it passed the House and passed the Senate and became the law of the land. That bill was to foster and perpetuate the American merchant marine to carry our commerce and for aid and assistance of the national defense. It was recognized at that time that the American merchant marine could not live and could not survive in competition with the types of seagoing vessels that were furnished by foreign nations with cheap labor, with no protection for life at sea, and with no comforts for the men that go down to the sea in ships. In that bill certain provisions were written for the American sailor, for the American man that made his life at sea, to protect and carry on his vocation and to carry on the history that had been written down through the years in brilliant feats of the American Navy and the American-flag ships of commerce. Then we began subsidies and then we began aid to construction. Then we gave aid to competition with foreign ships.

At the approach of the Second World War we had quite a reserve fleet in this Nation. The question arose, Would we help those in Europe who were fighting what we said at that time was the battle of civilization, the battle of Christianity, the battle of freemen to live on the face of this earth, and worship as they pleased and participate in democratic governments, and so forth. This country gave aid to the British Government, and to the French Government. We gave ships and we gave other materials.

Then the German submarine hordes destroyed great numbers of the foreign ships then plying the seas, and this caused the rise in value of the American reserve fleet. We, desiring to keep these ships under the American flag, did sell them very cheaply to the operators, to operators who were willing to venture in business, to operators who were willing to send their vessels into the submarine zones, to operators who were enticed by high freight rates at a peril not only of the vessel but to American sailors.

At that time the Committee on Merchant Marine of this House called the then Administrator of the Maritime Commission, Admiral Land, in executive session and in open session, and questioned him about the sale of these vessels; yes, the sale of these vessels at \$5 per ton, and so forth.

I remember the remark Admiral Land made to a question of mine. I said, "It is known, and we know, that eventually we will be drawn into this conflict, yet we are selling ships here at \$5 and \$6 a ton." He said to me, "Why, they are nothing but old crates." They were 10, 15, 20, and 25 years old. For a substantial purpose, for substantial and far-reaching and lasting commerce, no operator with any vision of business would have bought them and put them in the trade. Only did they purchase them on account of the times and the risks that the ships would incur. The price was cheap but the risk was great.

So we were drawn into the conflict. The conflict was pushed on our shore, on the coast of North Carolina, and on the northern coast. Ships were sunk right off my congressional district day after day. Then we went into the war. The President of the United States or someone in authority called Admiral Land and said, "We must have ships. Get them." What provision of Congress was made to get the ships? We were in an emergency. I am not trying to defend the Maritime Commission of that day; I am thinking that in justice and in fairness the history should be here reviewed. Jerry Land went out and produced the ships. He made some terrible bargains, as we see them today. He made some terrible contracts for ship construction, as the committee saw at that time, and we called him in on the carpet.

Then the war was over. We won this last war just as much through the efforts of the American seaman as we did through any doughboy or any infantry soldier or aviator or anybody else that fought in France or fought in Italy or fought in Africa. The men that carried the supplies on the Murmansk run were continuously under attack, and history will show it. History will show how many vessels and men we lost. We are beginning to forget it.

Then the war was over and we had more ships than we knew what to do with. Nobody was interested in them. Just like the supplies that were left in Europe by the Army and the Navy. Then your Merchant Marine Committee of the House had before them the problem of the preservation of this fleet and the writing of a Ship Sales Act. To the credit of the men who served on that

committee, they labored long and hard. The testimony lasted for months. It was months and months before the bill was written and submitted to the House. The House passed the bill, the Senate passed the bill, and the bill became law—to sell and preserve the American fleet which we had created then for the future protection of the national defense.

At the time we discussed the rule I expressed myself only, and only arose in opposition to the rule because of my interest in the prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations are endeavoring to do. This question of fair compensation in the act of 1936, section 902, I think it is, has always provoked and worried me. Nevertheless you gentlemen who are constitutional lawyers will have to decide that question yourselves. I am greatly interested, if possible, in some way to amend that section of the 1936 act, for I do not think—and I cannot get my mind and heart and soul to believe that where we sold these ships at such marked-down prices those who bought the ships should not be willing to make some concession in the resale or charter of these ships to the Government in case of emergency.

It must also be taken into consideration that in this ship subsidy construction program we required the companies to put in certain facilities that are applicable to the national defense and which are not necessary or usable in commerce. That point is overlooked. Other features have to go into the ship that the commercial operator does not desire. So much for that phase of it.

About the investigation that was carried on by the Merchant Marine Committee of the House which I sat on for months. We completely annihilated and routed the old Maritime Commission. We exposed many things that they should never have done, but which at the time I know because of their doing was the emergency that the country was in, at the time that the shortcomings or mis-administration was carried on. That should be taken into consideration in condemning the old members of the board. I think Admiral Jerry Land is a fine American citizen. It worried me and it hurt me at that time to see him so maligned and abused. But yet we did find things which showed the admiral was very negligent in his administration and that his office was very negligent in their administration and that other men connected with the old Maritime Commission were either ignorant or very negligent.

Now we come to the proposals in this bill, not only in the bill itself if it becomes law, but in the report, which the officials of the Maritime Commission advised the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning would be a directive to them in carrying out the provisions that were written in the bill with respect to contract sailings. These contracts that are made by the Maritime Commission are not made for a year. They are long-term contracts—5 and 10 years. They are contracts that a ship operator must prepare himself for;

contracts that require him to make scheduled sailings back and forth to European, Pacific and Asiatic ports. There have to be special arrangements made by the transportation company to fulfill the contracts. There are all kinds of considerations and conditions beyond, I expect, the knowledge of the average Member of this House; some of them were surprising to me. As you will see from the report, the committee requests the Maritime Commission as follows: "To distribute the number of voyages equitably among all shipping interests in order that each company may have a fair share of the subsidies provided by the Administration."

Mr. Chairman, that is simply impossible. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] at this point wants to challenge that statement I yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not desire to challenge the gentleman's statement, but I do desire to make these observations, that this act has tended to develop a monopoly in the shipping industry.

Mr. BONNER. I will answer that in just a minute. You are going to have a monopoly by this very provision.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a minute, now; let me make my observation, then the gentleman can controvert them.

When this act went into effect in 1936 you had 15 or 16 subsidized operators, and it all boiled down to what we now refer to as the Club 13. You have fewer today than you had when it first went into effect, and will as long as the gentleman's great committee fails to amend the Shipping Act of 1936, whereby you give to the shipping interests every conceivable fair advantage at the expense of the taxpayer in the form of 10-year contracts. Now getting back to the gentleman's statement, they are now engaged in the making of those contracts.

Mr. BONNER. The contracts are already made.

Mr. THOMAS. No; wait a minute; they are expiring all the time, are they not?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Just pass it around to somebody else; that is the way to break them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, there is the answer, pass them around to somebody else. Who can you pass them to? Who has the facilities? Who has the ability? Who owns the ships? Does any Member of this House own a fleet of vessels that they can pass around to you? Or do you know anybody that it can be passed to other than operating people in the shipping industry?

It is true—and I regret that I have not my table with me—that some companies have two and three hundred contract-sailing voyages; but the reason they have got them is because they have the ability and facilities to contract for them. You will notice another company that has only 5, 10, or 25 contracts. The reason they have no more is because they have neither the ships nor the facilities to contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BONNER. I know time is so valuable here this afternoon; nobody seems to be asking for it. I merely wanted to make my position clear and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his fine words.

Mr. BONNER. I really think the House ought to know something about what the merchant marine is for. Can the gentleman from Texas spare me any time?

Mr. THOMAS. We have already yielded to our distinguished friend 20 minutes on this side. We have only 2 hours and the time is allocated.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman from California yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Our time is committed.

Mr. BONNER. Well, I am through, let it go at that.

I hope the House uses the full time this afternoon because there are many facts that have not been developed, and I do not think it ought to be passed over and let it be said there is not some virtue and value and merit in the merchant marine of this country.

I think it is a slap in the face of the fine gentleman who made a sacrifice to come to Washington, Admiral Cochrane, to take over the maritime affairs and clean up what has been done in the past and show that it can be operated in a commendable manner—as it should be. And I am confident Admiral Cochrane will if given the proper opportunity.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can let the gentleman have a couple of minutes. When I said our time was committed I meant that the time was allocated. We can give the gentleman time by taking it away from somebody else but we gladly squeeze out 3 minutes for him.

Mr. BONNER. I had understood that all the time was not going to be used.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman like 3 minutes?

Mr. BONNER. I would appreciate it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. We yield the gentleman another 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it certainly is not my pleasure to get up here and try to defend what has been done in the past by the Maritime Commission. I am just as critical of them as is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] or anyone in the House, and I know he is honest about that. But there is something to be said in their defense.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is quite a fine gentleman. He is fair, he is one of the most able Members of the House, he is honest, he is rendering a great service to this Nation. I am in favor of economy. I have given a lot of my time in the last 2 months or more pointing out some of the terrible

negligence on the part of the leaders of our national defense. The committee I am a member of, and which I have the honor to head, has certainly pointed out conditions that should be corrected by legislation prepared by the Armed Services Committee of this House, or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

It was pointed out this morning what these ships were bought and sold for and every word the gentleman said was true. It is revolting. But I want to point to another thing.

Here is a long list of vessels, and companies that made claims against the Maritime Commission for losses. First, here is the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. that made a claim for \$1,300,000. The Commission offered to settle with them for \$776,000, which was refused. The matter went to the courts and the courts awarded them \$983,000. Of course, the Government had the expense of the court litigation.

Here is another company with a small claim, only \$50,000. The Commission of-

ferred \$15,000. The courts awarded \$25,000.

Here is another case where the company requested \$766,000. The Commission offered \$72,500. The courts awarded \$142,500.

There are some here that are much higher than that. Here is one, for instance, where the company requested \$1,498,000. The Commission offered to settle for \$400,000. The courts awarded \$825,000. They run all the way through on about that percentage basis. The complete table is as follows:

Just compensation cases decided by the courts, Sept. 1, 1950

Vessel	Court citation	Owner's claim	Just compensation determined by WSA	Just compensation determined by court
Alaskan	<i>American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. v. United States</i> , Southern District of New York, No. A 133-397, decided Jan. 21, 1949; 85 F. Supp. 815 (D. C. N. Y. 1949).	\$1,350,000.00	\$776,003.00	\$983,250.00
Cheerio	<i>Shain E. Baitary v. United States</i> , eastern district of South Carolina, Civil Action No. 1138, decided Nov. 28, 1944.	14,400.00	11,500.00	14,400.00
Dona Aurora	<i>De La Rama Steamship Co. v. United States</i> , southern district of New York, No. A 134-158, decided July 27, 1950.	1,960,000.00	\$1,333,333.33	2,082,000.00
Elna	<i>Ramselius v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 48538, decided May 19, 1950:			
	Value		\$147,700.00	\$188,025.00
	Charter hire		\$49,512.04	\$139,138.50
Gene	<i>Kendall v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 46199, decided Apr. 7, 1947; 108 Ct. Cls. 497 (1947).	50,000.00	15,000.00	25,000.00
Geoanna	<i>Seven-up Bottling Co. v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 45868, decided Dec. 2, 1946; 107 Ct. Cls. 402 (1946); cert. den. 332 U. S. 757 (1947).	175,000.00	20,000.00	30,000.00
George Washington	<i>Eastern Steamship Lines v. United States</i> , Circuit Court of Appeals, First Circuit, No. 4366, decided Dec. 31, 1948; 171 F. (2d) 589 (C. C. A., 1st, 1948).	1,739,872.00	667,500.00	1,100,000.00
Governor Cobb	<i>Trailerships, Inc. v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 45923, decided Apr. 1, 1946; 106 Ct. Cls. 215 (1946).	600,000.00	100,000.00	125,000.00
Hourless	<i>Wilson v. United States</i> , District Court, Massachusetts, No. 2237, C. A. decided Nov. 12, 1943.	12,500.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
International	<i>Smith-Douglas, Inc. v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 46289, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 81 F. Supp. 215 (1948).	586,592.05	\$236,018.78	\$290,000.00
MacArthur	<i>Richard S. Cors v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 46796, decided Jan. 5, 1948; 110 Ct. Cls. 66 (1948); 337 U. S. 325 (1949).	20,000.00	9,000.00	15,500.00
	Commissioner's Report, July 12, 1950 (rehearing).			
Maitland No. 1	<i>Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Nav. Co. v. U. S.</i> , Court of Claims, No. 46435, decided Dec. 6, 1948; 112 Ct. Cls. 240 (1948); 338 U. S. 396 (1949); 116 Ct. Cls. —; 1950 A. M. C. 681.	766,128.00	72,500.00	\$142,500.00
Mariner	<i>Charles Zubik v. United States</i> , Western District, Pennsylvania, No. 2815, decided June 22, 1945; 61 F. Supp. 4 (W. D. Penn. 1945).	15,000.00	7,000.00	10,000.00
Mary Kay	<i>Hugo Menke v. United States</i> , Northern District, California, No. 22447-R, decided July 21, 1943.	17,000.00	6,500.00	6,500.00
Mayflower	<i>Broadfoot v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 47091, decided Mar. 7, 1949; 113 Ct. Cls. 280 (1949).	300,000.00	12,670.00	30,000.00
Mizpah	<i>McDonald v. United States</i> , Court of Claims, No. 45876, decided June 5, 1950.	435,750.00	116,000.00	175,000.00
N. G. Arfaras	<i>John E. Green v. United States</i> , Southern District, Florida, No. 818-T, decided July 1945.	14,426.00	9,050.00	11,500.00
Norfolk	<i>United States v. Buxton Line</i> , 165 F. (2d) 993 (C. C. A. 4th 1948).	9,960.00	399.28	4,000.00
Off Duty	<i>Victor F. Sheronas v. United States</i> , District Court, Delaware, Civil Action No. 367, decided August 1946.	11,500.00	5,000.00	6,000.00
P. Kremasco	<i>John E. Green v. United States</i> , Southern District, Florida, No. 819-T, decided July 1945.	12,168.00	8,195.00	9,500.00
Pacific	<i>Turkington v. United States</i> , 108 Ct. Cls. 571 (1947).	47,500.00	11,500.00	25,000.00
President Warfield	<i>Baltimore Steam Packet Co. v. U. S.</i> , 112 Ct. Cls. 469 (1949).	1,934,905.00	525,000.00	990,000.00
Robert Henjes	<i>Helen K. Henjes v. United States</i> , 115 Ct. Cls. 264 (1950).	91,900.00	51,781.00	60,000.00
State of Delaware	<i>Wilson Line, Inc. v. United States</i> , 111 Ct. Cls. 764 (1948).	642,068.00	275,000.00	488,400.00
State of Maryland	<i>Baltimore Steam Packet Co. v. United States</i> , 112 Ct. Cls. 448 (1949).	1,448,000.00	400,000.00	800,000.00
State of Virginia	<i>Baltimore Steam Packet Co. v. United States</i> , 112 Ct. Cls. 433 (1949).	1,498,000.00	400,000.00	825,000.00
Stella Maris	<i>Brunson v. United States</i> , Southern District, California, No. 3659, O'C. Civ. l. decided Oct. 30, 1944.	22,000.00	13,500.00	15,000.00
Virginia	<i>National Bulk Carriers, Inc. v. United States</i> , 169 F. (2d) 943 (C. C. A., 3d 1948).	3,800,000.00	2,100,339.04	3,584,000.00
William C. McTarnahan	<i>National Bulk Carriers, Inc. v. United States</i> , 82 F. Supp. 495 (D. C. Del. 1949).	2,612,696.04	1,619,591.07	2,273,502.61
Yorktown	<i>Baltimore Steam Packet Co. v. United States</i> , 112 Ct. Cls. 438 (1949).	1,237,100.00	425,000.00	815,000.00
Zoric	<i>Robert Capoit v. United States</i> , Eastern District of Louisiana, No. CA 667, decided May 11, 1945.	15,625.00	7,500.00	15,000.00
Total			9,436,092.54	15,282,216.11

¹ \$130 per dead-weight ton.

² \$75 per dead-weight ton.

³ \$95 per dead-weight ton.

⁴ No determination made. This figure is based on amount paid on account.

⁵ WSA determination was based on a dead weight of 2,082 tons; the court's on a dead weight of 2,507 tons.

⁶ \$71 per dead-weight ton.

⁷ \$1.25 per dead-weight ton.

⁸ \$3 per dead-weight ton.

⁹ \$54 per dead-weight ton.

¹⁰ The Commissioner found that the value of the vessel as of September 1939 was \$88,800 or \$18 per dead-weight ton.

¹¹ \$66 per dead-weight ton.

¹² The court originally determined \$161,833.72 but on rehearing reduced the amount to \$142,500.

NOTE.—The court's determinations in the 31 cases amounted to 161.95 percent of Administrator's determinations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman able to tell from his memoranda there what court made the award? Was it the Court of Claims or was it another court?

Mr. BONNER. I do not happen to be a lawyer. I am one of the few laymen in this body and I am proud of it. I re-

spect the great ability of the legal fraternity here and I want to see the courts sustained and so forth. The gentleman can examine this himself. The Court of Claims I imagine.

Mr. JONAS. I thought the gentleman might have that knowledge.

Mr. BONNER. I will say, since the gentleman asked me that question, if that provision in this bill becomes law it will be a heyday for the lawyers because

I have asked the Commission myself what they would do with respect to contracts already made. You gentlemen who are attorneys know more about contracts than I do. But certainly a contract with the Government is a pretty sacred sort of thing. I would think, stronger than any contract with an individual in all probability. The Government is going to have an awful job getting away from these contracts.

Mr. JONAS. With reference to the gentleman's statement about the possibility of the lawyers having a heyday, as the gentleman probably recalls he and I served on the same committee together and took up this subject matter. If there is to be a heyday, judging from what little knowledge I gained in serving on that committee, by the action of the Maritime Commission it is merely switching the heyday away from the Maritime Commission and putting it in the hands of the legal profession, neither of which appeals to me very much.

Mr. LONNER. The gentleman rendered distinguished service on the committee, and his feelings and my feelings are not so far apart, not at all. I regret and I am sorry that all these things transpired, but I must be charitable and say that some of the charges made against the Maritime Commission, which look so awful now, reflect a picture of the time that the contracts and the transactions were taking place as against another time when the picture is entirely different.

Mr. JONAS. In that respect the gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the committee for the privilege of addressing them, but I must say that when the bill is read for amendment I shall offer an amendment which I hope will meet the approval of the committee and the membership of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am informed, that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said that an effort was being made to put something over in respect to the bill for grain aid to India—giving India and in the present overhanging famine situation there—and that I was trying to work out some plan of mine for another ECA under the guise of that particular bill.

I think the gentleman gives me much too much credit. I happen to be far down in seniority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and not at all the master mind he wants to make me out to be. Though, I would like very much to be considered as a leader in respect to this India grain bill. Now the reasons why this bill has not been brought to a vote as yet have not been much discussed on the floor and probably the question would not have been raised today had the gentleman not raised it, but it having been raised, I think it is very worthy of the consideration of the House.

We today hear speeches about how our position has suffered in Asia; that the cause of the free peoples has suffered the most damaging blows in Asia, yet we apparently fail to observe that while the Congress is not taking action on this

grain aid to India, we are suffering added serious damage to our position there which might well prove to be irreparable.

What is said to deter certain Members is what Mr. Nehru says about his position between the east and the west. Well, I think we know enough about political life in this House so that we can cut through political situations like that in India and get at the heart of the reason for this measure, and that is that this aid to India must come as a good will gesture from one democracy to another, regardless of who heads it. Let us remember, too, that the measure is now before us as a repayable loan and that India is known for paying her debts.

The riots that have taken place in India recently and the enormous advantage which the Communists take from them is at least in material partly due to the fact that India is not yet getting aid from us in grain, which we have the capability to send them. That is what is proving to be so damaging to our position in the Far East currently.

Let us not forget that there are 600,000,000 people in south and southeast Asia who are not in the Communist column, and two-thirds of those are in India. Yet, so far, we stay our hands from aiding these people contrary to the great democratic and humanitarian traditions of the United States, and at the same time we talk about building up our position in Asia.

Competition is what counts in this world, as well as other factors, and we have competition in respect to giving food aid to India, because the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Russians are moving in where we are leaving a vacuum. They are trying to make their deals with India today, Communist China for 100,000 tons of rice, and Soviet Russia for 1,000,000 tons of wheat. And what kind of deals are they making? We know that people who are desperate for food will make any kind of deals in order to get them food. The Communists will fasten the halter right around the neck of India if we let them. Russia is now trying to tie up all the burlap available in India, and thereby depriving us of one of the most vital materials in the world; and let us ask ourselves whether that is going to do us any good in our own grim struggle against communism.

No; we ought to act on this grain for India bill and it is my deep hope that we will do so now at long last, promptly.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow my distinguished fellow member of the Merchant Marine Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, because I believe that his experience on that committee, his very fine recollection of the problems that have come before it, will give us as good a basis for judgment as any Member of the House could. I compliment him on his views and I share them.

I would like to say at the outset that I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The provision upon which I am going to com-

ment is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill and is the provision which limits the number of voyages during any one year. In that connection I was very much concerned because I thought the language which was originally proposed almost indicated that the committee did not wish to have additional shipping concerns come under the subsidy program. I submitted language to the gentleman from Texas that might change that apparent indication. He was good enough to include in the proviso which is in the bill one of the phrases which I suggested to him, and I think it does definitely show that it is not the intention that this subsidy program should be limited to those who now have subsidies. However, I also submitted language which would permit an increase in the number of voyages every year to provide voyages for the new people who want to get into the industry. He did not agree on this point. His view was that the new people should be included under the provisions for the total number of voyages. Well, that led us to the situation in which we found ourselves this morning.

Our committee had a meeting, and before it came Mr. Gatov, a member of the Federal Maritime Board and Assistant Administrator under Admiral Cochrane. Mr. Gatov pointed these facts out to us. The shipping operators who are now under the subsidized program have contracts. Most of them, I believe, are 20-year contracts, or 10 years, I have forgotten. Most of them have 3, 4, or 8 years more to run. Under those contracts the operators each agree that they will sail a definite minimum number of voyages during each year, and if they fail to sail those voyages they have broken their contracts.

On the other hand, it is agreed that they may sail a maximum number of voyages, and any number they sail within that maximum the Maritime Administration is bound to pay for. Here is where the squeeze comes. If the operators sail the number of voyages which under their contract they are entitled to sail, they will use up more than the 1,450 voyages which it is proposed to authorize. If they do that, there will obviously be no voyages left for assignment to the other companies which wish to come in.

There are some seven applications, I believe, that are pending for 48 ships that would sail possibly another 400 voyages. Mr. Gatov said that the Administration would not create a deficiency by setting up the voyages for the new operators, and that if the bill stays as it is there will be no new lines started. I am interested in seeing some new lines started. I am more familiar with the Pacific coast situation than any other. I know that the services to China and Japan and the Philippines furnished by two companies have been very valuable in the past few years in carrying the commerce that goes across the Pacific Ocean. I think that we ought to have an expanding merchant marine, and I think there is no question but that this language will stop it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. In that particular field, is it not true that these companies have had to go out there and practically reestablish the business that was completely destroyed during the war?

Mr. ALLEN of California. That is exactly correct. The operators are, in the main, new people. There is another problem that goes with this. Our subsidy program requires that the shipping companies use American labor, which is accustomed to a higher standard of living than foreign labor. It requires that repairs be made in American yards, where the same situation applies to the standards of American shipyard labor. If we do not have our ships running, we do not have our shipyards operating to take care of them.

I was rather astounded to learn the figures from a letter recently received concerning the shipyards on San Francisco Bay. On April 19, 1951, in the three yards which have survived the war, there were 2,250 men employed. A year ago, on July 1, roughly when the Korean incident broke out, there were about 6,600. There has been a decrease of 65.91 percent during that intervening period.

To show what we need in emergency times during World War II, for example, the three yards employed something over 63,000. There has been a 96-plus percent drop-off. If we include the temporary war-industry yards, Kaiser and Marin Ship, and so forth, we now have something like 1 percent of the men working now that we needed during the war period.

I know something about the shortage of ships. Let me give you two or three examples. We had a tramp fleet about 2 years ago consisting of about 1,100 American ships, which was an extraordinary number, but which was required at that time to carry our commerce. During the period of a year it dropped off to about 100. The tramp fleet is not subsidized. It does not survive in foreign competition. At the outset of the Korean war we had about 100 operating. In the nature of things, about half of them were in port and half of them away. We found ourselves with 46 ships available, ready to operate, fully manned and equipped, and available to the military service. It was necessary for us to charter 13 foreign vessels to carry our cargo. The Navy got some Iranian, Greek, Panamanian, Canadian, and British ships to fill the immediate need until we got some of our own ships from the laid-up fleet in operation a few weeks later.

In time of war the passenger ships become troop transports. We now have in operation only three which travel at a speed greater than 22 knots, which is the speed usually attributed to modern enemy submarines. I well remember the personal experience while in the Navy in 1943 of traveling in an old Hog Islander built in 1917 during World War I, traveling at a speed of about 8 knots, unescorted, for 19 days, in waters in which enemy submarines were occasionally operating. Something over 20 of the men aboard were carried in a forward cargo hold, where they had no comforts

or conveniences except a temporary stairway installed through the hatch cover, through which there was some ventilation and on which they could reach the open deck. It is not surprising that I should favor the maintenance of a reasonable number of fairly good ships during peacetime in order that they might be available to give reasonable comfort and safety to the men and materials which are carried in them during wartime.

An operating subsidy in the shipping business is not a guaranty of profits. On the contrary, an operator who makes an unreasonable profit finds the excess applied in reduction of the subsidy. Our laws properly require the use of American labor on American ships and that repairs be made in American shipyards. All but a minor part of the subsidy involved is to offset the disparity between the cost of American labor as against foreign labor with regard to the wages, subsistence, repairs and maintenance of the ships that are subsidized.

I hope that the language of the proviso, which is found on page 45 at line 12 of the bill, will be stricken from it by amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the course of the debate our friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in talking about his amendment made reference to the love life of a tuna. I know oftentimes when you get into something like that you get into something you do not know very much about. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] got to talking about something there that, while his intentions were good, is a subject about which he cannot claim to be an expert.

I would like to review the program that our tuna industry on the West Coast has been engaged in during the past 25 or 30 years. We have built an industry out there that has grown to be the largest fishing industry in the entire United States. In the course of the last few years we have had a lot of complications and a lot of troubles in our fishing operations off the coast of South America and Central America to such a degree that a few years ago the American Government and the Government of Costa Rica and several of the South and Central American governments met and discussed some of the fishing operations and fishing problems that our fleet was involved with. It was hoped that some of the very complicated and bitter controversies that were growing out of the fishing operations in the waters down as far south as the Galapagos Islands could be cleared up and settled in a friendly way. As a result of these talks a convention was formed, and out of that there was formed what is called the Inter-Ameri-

can Tropical Tuna Commission. That Commission was ratified by the other body in 1949, and then it set out its preliminary steps in organization. Exploratory work in developing the biological facts about tuna is particularly needed. In our particular fishing industry we do not use the seine operation, but we employ large boats, some as long as this room. They ply 6,000 miles south of California, off the coast of South and Central America. They churn the waters with small bait, and when the tuna arrives to take the bait they catch the tuna with hooks. They do not have much trouble with Latin-American governments so far as actually catching the tuna because they are several hundred miles off the coast. But in order to get bait to chum the tuna with, these boats have to put into the coastal waters of the South and Central American countries. In doing so they often run into complications with these governments. These governments fear our industries might take their natural resources, and, while they do not need them today, in some future time they may want this bait fish, and therefore they resent our American boats coming in. As a result they have set up a high tax on fishing rights in those waters.

Our industry men have negotiated from time to time with these governments, but it has been impossible to arrive at satisfactory long-term agreements. We need a larger scope of coverage—one that can only be encompassed by government-to-government discussions and cooperative explorative methods on the habits of the tuna and the bait fish.

I would like to point out to you that this industry represents a big factor in our economy on the West Coast. Last year, for instance, 11,000,000 cases of tuna were consumed, which represents an average of 3½ cans per man, woman, and child. It represented about \$100,000,000 valuation. About \$125,000,000 is invested in the industry in the way of canning equipment and boats.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I have very limited time, but I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield to me is because I think there is a distinction which is not being made. What the tuna industry really wants is not necessarily money. They have a very large income. They have been willing to do their own research work. But they have to have certain authority and certain backing from the United States or from some international board before they can do the research that they want to do. That carries out what I said a moment ago on the floor that we have to go out to the States and to private industry and go back to the people and say, "We do not have to pay all that. We can give you help on those things. But why should we put up Federal money when we are \$257,000,000,000 in the red to pay for something that you can afford to pay or the State can afford to pay?"

I think that ought to enter into the discussion and Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman has made a very good point and a point that I was going to bring out. Our industry has developed itself independently from its own private funds. We want to keep independent. We do not want Government interference if we can get away from it. The point is that this industry cannot go to the South American governments. We have to have a Government-to-Government approach, and that is why we have asked the State Department to come in and assist us officially in getting this problem worked out. We are not asking for a free ride at all. We can pay our way, but we must have a Government-to-Government approach to get any action.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I have asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might emphasize the point that this problem should not be referred to facetiously as one of studying the love life of the tuna fish. There is nothing wrong with studying the love life or sex habits of the tuna fish or the love life or sex habits of halibut as has been done in co-operation with the Canadian Government for almost 30 years. This is an important international problem. It affects a large segment of our population, and affects an industry of which this country may well be proud. It should not be laughed down, as I understand was done yesterday in talking about the love life of racoons. So far as I am concerned, and I know a little about the subject, the State Department very properly negotiated the treaty and formed the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission because without it you folks on the lower west coast of California could not get the bait you must have to fish for the tuna, and you would have a \$100,000,000 industry ruined. You will find the following article just written by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheries Institute, Inc., highly interesting:

LOVE LIFE OF TUNA, HALIBUT, AND FROGS?

Efforts are unwittingly being made for political purposes to laugh out of existence the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Halibut Commission, just as Senator Pat Harrison, by a single speech some twenty-odd years ago, killed research on bullfrogs in the United States for perhaps all time. Meanwhile, frog legs have become an expensive luxury in the United States at prices so high that this valuable food is not available for thousands of people suffering from diabetes who, like other citizens, would like a change in their diet. Had the Fish and Wildlife Service had a reasonable amount of research funds these past years, frog legs might now be available at reasonable cost to diabetic patients. As it is, the supply must come from wild stocks in the southern swamps and from imports from Cuba. Supplies cannot be maintained consistently and the price range is high. Meanwhile, Japan developed a very profitable frog leg industry which employs many people. Senator Pat Harrison's famed ridicule made the news headlines, but destroyed any hope for Federal appropriations for bullfrog research and today the State of Mississippi

lacks an industry that might have provided extensive employment for her population and a change in diet for the diabetics of the Nation.

Now the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is threatened by stories going around on Capitol Hill about the love life of the tuna, and a story on the love life of halibut was printed in a Washington newspaper last week.

Nothing is more dangerous to the fishing industry of America than for responsible persons in public life to ridicule our industry by satirical remarks concerning the sex life of fish and shellfish. The existence of the seafood industry depends upon sex life to the same extent as does the cattle and hog and poultry industries, yet we seldom hear of farmers' appropriations for research being curtailed because the meat, poultry, and even the honeybee industries are dependent on sex life, as indeed are all agriculture crops, not to mention the perpetuation of humanity itself.

The fishing industry resents these love life stories that are told for the purpose of killing Federal appropriations for research. Indeed, the public itself is gradually becoming aware of the fact that mankind must depend more and more on the products of the sea for maintaining the human race. Those nations recognizing this fact by amply providing research facilities for utilizing the extensive protein and mineral resources of the seas and lakes and rivers will still be around, while those nations who laugh off their responsibilities for sea-food research will be in the category of ancient Rome.

Ask your Congressman why he discriminates against the love life of fish, but encourages the love life of cattle and hogs and corn and cotton. Let him know that the fishing industry resents being laughed out of court, to defeat appropriations.

Fifteen years is a long time, but that much time and effort and patience has been expended to bring the work of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission through an international treaty, and even the exigencies of war do not necessitate complete abandonment of 15 years of work that gives such great promise for the utilization and wise conservation of the tuna resources of North and South America.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman makes a very good point.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. As a former executive of the California Division of Fish and Game, I think I know something about the problem that confronts us. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] touched on it when he spoke about it, and the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] touched on it when he spoke about the bait and the so-called love life of the sardine, which is used for bait. We nearly lost the sardine industry on the Pacific Coast because we were not familiar enough with the biological facts surrounding the propagation of the fish and because we overfished. We have run into great difficulties. I may say that the State of California spends a great sum of money on this each year. What we need is a greater study of the fishery resources of this country which can be increased only by knowing more about its love life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would just like to bring home three points: The first is we do not ask for a specific subsidy; we want to be independent. Second, we need to encourage good relationships with the countries south of the border. This convention will assist in better relations with Latin America and a mutual increase in prosperity for all our peoples. Third, if we are going to study the love life of cattle, hogs, and everything else in this country, certainly there can be nothing wrong in studying the love life of the tuna which also is a very important segment of the American economy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, about 12 years ago I became interested in the stockpile program for strategic and critical materials. I was amazed to find that we had no law establishing a stockpile. The Military Affairs Committee went about the business of writing a law known on its enactment as Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. That was the first stockpiling law in our Nation's history. In 1946 we revised that law in the Seventy-ninth Congress as Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is the present stockpile law.

I have throughout the past 12 years had occasion to study this matter intensively, and I see on the floor here just now men who have worked with me in that field. I refer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FEN-
TON]—I saw him here a moment ago; he is gone now. I have seen several men here this afternoon who have a like interest with mine regarding the welfare and well-being and adequacy of our stockpile of strategic and critical materials. I will say this, that back in 1946 when we wrote Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina and I had definitely in mind a yardstick, an objective, to give this Nation a little better protection in the matter of strategic and critical materials for any war challenge that might come. I notice also the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who has always been active with us.

We have watched this program carefully and very diligently throughout all the years. The objective was set in 1946 before we had what we now recognize as a known adversary; but when the Korean war came along we had not achieved over 34 percent of the planned objective of what was originally estimated as our need. When the Korean war came along those needs were also boosted tremendously, so that here even with the added acquisitions of the past year we have still only approximately 40 percent of the stockpile on hand.

I am very pleased with the stepped-up record of the responsible officials of the

Munitions Board and GSA in the matter of the acquisition of stockpiles during the past year. But I was alarmed when I saw in this bill no item for additional funds for stockpiling. I then turned to the hearings and the committee report. I find from the hearings reference to the fact that there is a billion-dollar item in the President's budget message, and also that there is a plan for the Committee on Appropriations to take that matter up later on. May I inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not the plan?

Mr. THOMAS. First, may I make an observation, then I will answer the question. This subcommittee wants to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] for his careful study and hard work on the stockpiling program. A large part of its success is certainly due to his untiring efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say that at no time in the last 3 years or any other time—if I am in error I wish to be corrected but if my memory serves me correctly—has this committee ever denied one 5-cent piece for the stockpiling of critical material. As a matter of fact, in the fiscal year 1951 here is what this committee granted them in dollars and cents: First, in the 1950 bill we gave them \$525,000,000, no reduction, for the stockpiling of critical material. In 1951 they came in with a regular bill requesting \$605,000,000, which was granted. There was a supplemental bill for 1951, \$598,637,000, then a second supplemental in 1951 for \$1,834,000,000, a total for 1951 of \$3,038,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. The total we have given, the gentleman from Iowa should know, in 1951 alone was \$3,038,548,370. The total we have given to date, including both cash and contract, is \$4,458,548,370. The total they have on hand, which may interest the gentleman from Iowa, presently is \$1,623,543,734.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is not yet expended?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not yet expended.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. That brings out the information I wanted to have in this discussion.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not obligated.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for the information. I think it is highly important to get that before the Nation today in the course of this debate because the absence of any fund for stockpiling of strategic and critical materials in this appropriation bill may be misunderstood. I understand from the hearings that you are going to give the budget item for stockpiling further attention in the near future and I am behind that 100 percent.

This stockpile is the point where we start the adequacy of our defense. This is where we look to get the materials to build modern weapons, and we need more and more modern weapons and we cannot get them unless we have these particular materials. I know there is controversy in private industry about this stockpiling. I know that we were very wise when we placed in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress that no part of the stockpile material could be taken out of the stockpile without authority from the Congress. It is because there are people who are watching that stockpile with an eye to getting some of it for their needs for civilian production that we have got to be careful. But we cannot have better insurance than this stockpile if we are going to match our strength against a world power at any time in the future. That is my real deep concern in the matter.

I commend the committee and hope they will continue their attention in this field and appreciate their giving me this information. I am looking forward to further developments. I am not going to stop with just this committee because I am going to keep everlastingly on the trail of the Munitions Board—they know it down there, I do not have to acquaint them with the fact I am constantly on their trail—also GSA—to make sure that they do not take their eyes off the real objective—that we may have an adequate national defense stockpile as the protection that we are entitled to have. Our action on these appropriation bills will help guarantee to my son and his buddies who are now fighting in Korea, that we are back of them with the sinews of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have requested these few minutes to make an inquiry with respect to only one or two items in this bill. One of them is with regard to the Government's contribution to the retirement fund of the Civil Service Commission. I notice the appropriation calls for \$300,000,000 while the amount requested was \$320,000,000. The request has been cut by \$20,000,000. I think the membership of the House should know that we really do not save anything by reducing this particular item. The fact remains that the retirement fund lacks about \$5,000,000,000 of being actuarially sound. In other words, it would take approximately \$5,000,000,000 if the retirement fund were placed on a basis similar to that of life insurance companies.

The other matter I wanted to call attention to is the appropriation for the Comptroller General's Office.

It appears the committee has seen fit to reduce considerably the amount requested by the Office of Comptroller General. In all probability the members of the committee felt they had reasons for doing it, but I just want to say this is one agency of the Government that is an extremely important one, and is efficiently operated and managed. After

all, it is the arm of Congress. It is the auditor. It is the watchdog for the Congress. It is headed by a very distinguished and able American, a man who is in my judgment doing an excellent job in his position. This is one agency that I would not want to see crippled in any respect.

In looking at the hearings it would appear that this committee has seen fit to cut down some of the top-flight positions for that office and has also reduced the amount of funds. I would like to have that explained, because I do not want this particular agency crippled in any respect. To reduce its efficiency and its ability to carry on will cost the Government many times in expenditures what might be saved by comparatively small reductions to this agency.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to our distinguished friend from Kansas that the committee shares his point of view exactly 100 percent. It is an agency that is an arm of the Congress. As a matter of fact, they have a tremendous budget, and we reduced them a little less than \$500,000, and that reduction has come about by virtue of the fact that they transferred some of their activities to the Post Office Department where heretofore have been in the General Accounting Office. Instead of cutting down the top-flight positions, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, if he will read the report carefully, we did a little legislating, and I hope the House will forgive us, but we increased his top-flight positions by five. He wanted eleven and we gave him five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that. This is one agency that is headed by a group of outstanding, efficient men.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the gentleman will agree with us and he will not think we are sinning when we gave him those five.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly not. If the Comptroller General felt he should have more than five in those higher positions, he would favor doing so. He would not ask for them unless they were needed. He would be sure to select capable men qualified under civil service, and as I stated before, expenditures here will mean greater economies in other departments of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman made a fine statement, and we greatly appreciate it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I opposed this rule because I considered that the provisions in this bill, especially as they relate to housing, were manifestly unfair and unjustifiable. No one can deny that there is still a great shortage in housing; but, unfortunately, my Republican friends, especially the leaders, never seem to realize that the ex-servicemen and the people of this Nation are entitled to have a roof over

their heads. I called their attention to it years ago. Unfortunately, they have always more or less opposed housing legislation. In this bill they actually scuttled the laws that we passed in aid of housing, which I greatly regret. Of course, they did that under the pretense that they desire economy and to save money, which is only said on the floor of the House for political reasons and for no other. They have even inveigled some of the Democrats to vote with them to make possible the adoption of some of these outrageous restrictions as to public housing.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has said. In committee I opposed the provisions of the bill relating to housing. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of the Budget attempted to cut the 10-percent allotment to public housing which had been created by the Public Housing Act of 1949, when it was thought there would be 810,000 housing units started this year. That was the reason for the cut of public housing units from 135,000 to 75,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the gentleman, we need more. But certainly this cut is unwarranted.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman. The other side does not object to using the materials for the construction of plants here and there, many of them unnecessary, but when it comes to housing they always seem to be opposed to it, and I have called their attention to it, that the people will resent it, and they will.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it the contention of the gentleman that only the Federal Government can build houses?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no. You know that I have advocated that private industry should build houses, but, unfortunately, up to a few years ago, they failed because we failed to adopt the legislation, due to the opposition of you gentleman on that side. Had we adopted the laws that were recommended by President Roosevelt 15 and 12 years ago, there would have been no shortage of housing today; but at that time, when we could have built houses for perhaps 50 cents of the dollar value today, you objected; your party is responsible for the great shortage that exists today, where the tenants are being mulcted by the owners of apartment buildings to such an extent that it is really, in many instances, an outrage and a crime.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry we did not build the houses then—

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. PHILLIPS. By private ownership; but does not the gentleman think that regulation X is the main impeding restriction we have today?

Mr. SABATH. I would not say that because I have not studied that problem.

All I want to say in conclusion is this: A great deal has been said about the

Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I say this, that our committee 2 years ago started that investigation. It is due to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], its present chairman, and many of its members, that the old Board, that was altogether too liberal, from my viewpoint, and that I criticized, was eliminated. The new Board is trying to safeguard the rights and interests of our Treasury and our country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the report on this appropriation bill, I was somewhat puzzled by one of the recommendations dealing with the estimates of the General Services Administration. In serving as a member of this body it has been my pleasure to work with the Administrator of General Services Administration on several matters and although this agency has not been in operation long I have been impressed with the abilities of the Administrator and the manner in which the activities of the General Services Administration are managed and supervised. I have also familiarized myself somewhat with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by Public Law 754 of the Eighty-first Congress. As I recall, this legislation was one of the first enactments of the Congress implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It merged several semiautonomous bureaus and administrations into the General Services Administration, vesting the complete authority for the management of affairs in the Administrator. As previously indicated, this legislation was consonant with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to eliminate the specific legislative authorities running directly to bureaus or constituent units of organization which, of course, tended to hamper or restrict the authority of the head of an agency to manage his agency's affairs in accordance with his judgment.

The recommendation of the committee to which I allude is contained on page 10 of the report wherein it is stated as follows:

The committee is of the opinion that it would be helpful to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and to GSA if funds for the Public Buildings Service were submitted in a separate appropriation paragraph. As pointed out heretofore, this item constitutes nearly 90 percent of the entire operating expense appropriation and consists, to a large degree, of fixed charges. The new appropriation item should include all sums required for the administration and operation of activities under the Public Buildings Service from the Commissioner down, consisting of the rental of space, operation, and maintenance of buildings in and outside the District of Columbia, space acquisition and utilization, and related activities. The committee requests, therefore, that the Bureau of the Budget, with the assistance of GSA, submit this portion of the operating expense item as a separate appropriation paragraph in the 1953 budget.

To me, this appears to be completely incompatible with the intent of Congress in enacting the Federal Property and Ad-

ministrative Services Act and vesting the authority and complete responsibility for the management of the affairs and activities of the General Services Administration within the Administrator. Likewise, this recommendation seems to me to be in conflict with the objectives and legislative concepts as expressed by the Congress in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission and provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act recognize the necessity of eliminating duplicative management and administrative elements of related activities. They permit the responsible administrative official, in this case the Administrator of General Services Administration, to consolidate such unnecessary and overlapping independent activities. An essential ingredient of this facility is the establishment of an appropriation structure which is consonant with this over-all management concept. The relative proportions of funds to be utilized on individual programs under the single general management actually are not significant.

Without reasonable consolidation and without control in the Administrator, budgeting, financing, accounting, and reporting transactions are multiplied in almost geometric proportion. Information recently developed by the Expenditures Committee points up the almost unbelievable amount of paper work required in procurement and related financing and accounting operations at the Detroit Ordnance Arsenal. The proposed change in the appropriation structure of the General Services Administration differs only in degree and not in principle.

The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 provides in section 113 (a) that—

The head of each executive agency shall establish and maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide: (1) Full disclosure of the financial results of the agency's activities; (2) adequate financial information needed for the agency's management purposes; (3) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets for which the agency is responsible, including appropriate internal audit; (4) reliable accounting results to serve as the basis for preparation and support of the agency's budget requests, for controlling the execution of its budget, and for providing financial information required by the Bureau of the Budget under section 213 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23); (5) suitable integration of the accounting of the agency with the accounting of the Treasury Department in connection with the central accounting and reporting responsibilities imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 114 of this part.

I had thought that in accordance with the authorities conferred upon the Administrator by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and the legislative intent of the Congress with respect to budget and accounting matters, that this agency's budget has been presented in a manner which reflects reliable financial effects of each and all of its functions and activities. If this is not the case I feel sure the GSA can

and will perform properly under existing appropriations structure.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that this agency is attempting to streamline its budget and accounting operations and plans to make a further appropriation consolidation, subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committee, which will lessen their accounting burden but will at the same time enable and permit them to report to Congress the full disclosure of the financial results of each individual activity of the agency.

Of course, as the Members of this body know, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 was, in fact, a legislative enactment and sanction of the joint accounting improvement program currently being conducted by the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. Therefore, it follows that the recommendation as contained in the committee report is in conflict with the joint accounting improvement program.

It is therefore of deep concern to me that the Committee on Appropriations should make a recommendation which tends to revert to the adoption of some of the ills as pointed out by the Hoover Commission which will tend to restrict the flexibility of the Administrator of the General Services Administration in the management of one of the most important agencies of the Government, and would place an added and unnecessary accounting burden on the agency.

The proposed changes in the appropriation structure seem to me to tend toward the kind of condition we found at the Detroit Arsenal. I feel certain that the committee does not intend to promote such a condition. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions. I believe it was his committee's primary concern to get before it all information covering the related activities of the General Services Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. You have no particular desire to set up a separate paragraph or to transfer jurisdiction of authority to a unit head, do you?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. And you would not want to take any action which would increase the accounting difficulties or the administrative burden?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. If the committee report would carry to that extreme the requirements on General Services you would not insist upon it?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who has certainly carried a tremendous load and who has done so much constructive work along this line, that of all the things the committee is interested in certainly one is to avoid any increase in administrative expense. You can certainly rely upon us that all we want is a clear-cut picture of all the administrative details. If they can get those details to the committee in any shape, manner, or form we will welcome it. We do not want them to go to any extra trouble. If they can do it without setting up any bookkeeping

activities, so much the better from our point of view.

Mr. HARDY. I am deeply grateful to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, so that the House may enjoy the National Polish Day ceremony.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire what time the House will meet tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS. I will ask unanimous consent later that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to convene tomorrow at 11 a. m.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. CHIEF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 271) entitled "An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-20.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any en-

rolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] for 2 hours.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in the history and development of modern democratic governments, it is usually the constitution of these governments that sets the standards and the rallying points of advancing political and economic freedom.

The Polish tradition of liberty and democracy found brilliant expression in the 3d of May constitution of 1791, the most democratic constitution to have been promulgated in the Old World up to that time. And it was the only constitution received by any nation without bloodshed. This constitution, expressing the genius and the tradition of the Polish people, recognized the equality of all men, proclaimed religious liberty and established by basic law the freedom of thought and speech. This constitution, this charter of human liberty, was adopted in Poland on the very heels of the American and French revolutions. Thus Poland joined with the new American Republic in enshrining in basic law the ideals of human dignity and liberty.

The similarity between the American Constitution and the Polish Constitution, of Polish liberty and American liberty, was not one of mere coincidence in time. Historic contribution to American independence and to victory in our war of liberation was made by many gallant sons of Poland, whose names are well known in American history, heroes who rushed to these shores as soon as they heard the thrilling call of men to arms in the battle of liberty.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 did not, of course, long endure. The tyrants of Russia, Austria, and Prussia could not tolerate this bold flowering of human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth, and freedom, this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation.

Not until 1918, through the intervention of that great President, Woodrow Wilson, was Poland again free. It was President Wilson who then expressed as our American doctrine the position that every people has the inherent right to determine its own national destiny.

Today again the torch of liberty is extinguished in Poland. And yet the name of Poland should bring warmth to the hearts of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Our United States owes a special debt of honor to the Polish people, they whose heroism has kept alive so long the light of freedom in Eastern Europe. It is Poland which was made the reason for opening of World War II. It is Poland which, ironically

enough, we find nevertheless today in the toils of Soviet tyranny and slavery.

There is a tragic injustice in Poland's fate, in view of her glorious record of determination and sacrifice for the cause of liberty throughout the world. But Poland's fate is not unique. In our kind of world there will scarcely be justice for Poland until there is justice for Eastern Europe, justice for all of mankind.

The mask has now been stripped from the face of Communist aggression, and underneath it we find the grim countenance of Soviet imperialism which threatens to engulf not only Europe but eventually all of the world, unless the free people of the world come to an early awakening of the grim truth.

In 1939 Poland had to stand alone and hopelessly outnumbered by the Nazi hordes in its heroic defense of its freedom. The subsequent defeat of Hitler in World War II did not bring relief to stricken Poland. The world was told that Poland would again be free and independent. But the United States had not yet awakened to its responsibilities as a world power and defender of freedom. And so it was that Stalin was able to carry out his diabolical plot against Poland while the rest of the world stood helplessly by and watched a noble, freedom-loving people bludgeoned into submission. The Russian guarantees of free elections and freedom of the press proved to be empty and cynical pledges which they had no intention of fulfilling. Under a brutal campaign of terror, slavery, purges, and tyranny, Poland, a shattered nation, became subjected to Russian generals and Kremlin bureaucrats in Polish uniforms.

The tragic story of Poland is important not only to Poles but to all of the freedom-loving people of the world. It should constantly remind us of two very important lessons. First, it should impress upon our minds the necessity of international cooperation and action through the United Nations to prevent aggression and to protect the independence of small nations. And it should also be an everlasting reminder that when the Russians speak of democracy and promise freedom, they are in reality thinking of tyranny and promising slavery.

But the United Nations, in order to continue to retain the respect of the civilized world, must have a firm determination to act with courage and speed to prevent aggression. It will then again be the hope of mankind and capture the imagination of all peoples, even those living under the iron curtain.

The determination to finally stand up and resist aggression in Korea was a great step forward. It revived a light of hope to the free people of the world. But let us not let them down again, for we may never have another chance.

Now that the future of our own America is so obviously threatened by the menace of Soviet aggression, it is imperative that all Americans be made aware of what Soviet ruthlessness and what the callousness of Red Russian policy really means.

The American people and the world must be told also and clearly what our policy is, and we must firmly stand by it.

This is no time for partisanship and no time to seek partisan capital out of a critical world situation. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. And we today are engaging in an old-fashioned partisan battle while our very existence is at stake.

We have no longer any moral or legal grounds to remain bound to the compacts of Yalta and Tehran. Russia has violated them in spirit and in deed.

But there are some among us today who are willing to make political capital out of the Yalta and Tehran agreements and in the same breath advocate a defeatist policy of isolationism; a policy of refusal to help Europe defend itself against communism, a policy which not only brings bleak gloom and despair to those in Poland and other countries beyond the iron curtain in whom there still remains some hope and confidence, but what is most tragic, a policy which cannot help but bring communism closer to our own shores.

And nowhere in the recent policy speeches in the great debate can we yet find any assurance that those who rise against the Russian despot elsewhere can count on our moral and material support. We seem strangely indifferent to the fate of those on the other side of the iron curtain.

I am thoroughly convinced that the people of Poland, in whom the spirit of freedom and liberty has always burned brightly, cannot and will not submit indefinitely to the rule of their Communist oppressors. I am confident that when the opportunity presents itself, the Polish people will throw off the yoke of dictatorship and again seek the freedom and independence which is their right and their ultimate destiny.

One of our best allies in the coming struggle with Soviet Russia, a struggle which appears to be more certain with every passing day, will be those Polish patriots who have so long made their mark upon the pages of the struggle for liberty throughout the world.

Let us proclaim in ringing words that the free portion of mankind will never reconcile itself to the permanent enslavement of those now subjugated by the Communists; that we shall not consider our job done until there is a complete liberation of all the Sovietized people. Let us break down their awful sense of isolation from the democratic world.

And words alone will not be enough. They must be backed by deeds—dramatic, forthright, and unequivocal. Only then shall we come to the great conflict of our era with clean hands and clean consciences. Only then will we capture the powerful, and perhaps decisive, weapon represented by the explosive discontents, by the aspirations for freedom, in the Communist dominated part of the world.

President Truman on April 6, 1945, said:

We shall refuse to recognize any Government imposed on any nation by the force of any foreign power.

Let us repeat and implement that pledge with a positive and forceful declaration that we shall never rest until

true freedom is restored to all freedom-loving people of the world, and until the obscene shadows of Kremlin power and Kremlin ambitions are lifted by the combined might of freemen on both sides of the iron curtain.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for the scholarly, splendid address he has made, and to join with him in the expressions he has given to the House today. I also want to say that I, too, look forward to the day, as I know the people of America do, when once again there will sound from the radios of Poland the strains of Chopin's Polonaise Militaire proclaiming to the world that Poland is again free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day in the annals of history records the great advance of the liberty loving and democratic people of Poland. On May 3, 1791, the Parliament of Poland adopted her famous constitution. This was a milestone on the highway of progress which followed along the same course as that prescribed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; which made America the land of the free, the champion of the oppressed, and a friend of all mankind. On the basis of our constitutional achievements, the world today looks to us for guidance and support.

Over the course of centuries the people of Poland have made progress and their objective has always been to live peacefully with their neighbors, while at home their fundamental desire, premised on a wholesome family life imbued with a religious fervor, was patterned to grow into a nation dedicated to the principle of perpetuating human dignity and the freedom of the citizen. The concept among the people of Poland, which is so deeply ingrained, holds that government is the servant and not the master, and accordingly that the duly chosen representatives of the people must carry out the untrammelled will of the electorate and not impose its autocratic will upon those whom it was intended to serve.

The people of Poland at this time, subjugated as they are by a despised and unfriendly foreign ideology and power, yearn for the day when the yoke of this oppression may be broken and discarded forever and the perverted and godless foe driven beyond its border. The people of Poland walled off behind the iron curtain may be assured that the American people, spurred by the patriotism and exemplary lives of more than 7,000,000 Americans of Polish antecedents, share the hopes and the aspirations of the people of Poland. We want to assure them, Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the adoption of the great Polish document of freedom that we have neither forgotten nor abandoned them to the bestiality of communistic dominance and control. No barrier, be it iron curtain or Chinese wall, will ever isolate or divide the people of Poland from their friends in the United

States of America. Every loyal American prays for the day when friendly relations between the Poles and the Americans may be freely and happily resumed, when the communistic hordes will be driven out or destroyed, and the glory that is Poland once again brought into its own. The imprint of the Muscovite horde and the welt of their murderous whiplash will be eradicated and healed, please God at the earliest day.

We in America, like our brethren in Poland, hold fast to the teaching of our Holy Mother the Church, deriving our daily sustenance in our undying faith that Poland's bonds will be broken and that she will rise again along with her sister nations who have been chained and enslaved by the fiends of communism. The spirit of the true Christian like a cuirass will give protection to the faithful people of Poland in their unshaken will as expressed in their daily prayers. Each day as the sun rises they will continue to raise their eyes and their hearts toward Mary the Queen of the Polish Crown, and in her intercession there will be the final assurance of Poland's complete restoration and the resumption of Poland's rightful place in the family of friendly nations.

The periods of persecution which the people of Poland seemingly must endure from time to time tends to temper the spirit which makes them a race which can never be exterminated and which will live forever.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the institution of the constitution of Poland.

After centuries of subjugation and the travail of conquering partitions, Poland emerged from the maelstrom of World War I as an integrated and full-fledged democracy in middle Europe.

Modern Poland and the democratic constitution under which it functioned were a monument to the political genius of Woodrow Wilson.

Modeled closely upon our own scheme of representative government, the Polish Constitution brought order to a people who had cherished and nurtured the hope of liberty with grim determination against seemingly hopeless odds throughout years of desperation.

How bitter, then, must be the hearts of the liberty-loving Poles in viewing today what appears to be the wreckage of their hopes.

The constitution so laboriously brought forth for the governance of free Poland is today prostituted to the manipulations of a puppet government which serves the beck and call of its masters in the Kremlin.

Its guaranties of political, social, and religious freedom are reduced to grimly ironic platitudes in the obscene mouthings of men who neither love Poland nor respect any constitution.

The tragedy which has befallen Poland in the form of her present partition is the more awful because it seemingly was accomplished under the forms and procedures of her democratic constitution.

The world outside the iron curtain knows, however, that the overpowering army of a hostile neighbor is the cause of Poland's plight, and that her constitution is truly suspended under the tyrannical government which rules her soil as a satellite of Soviet Russia.

When our own great charter of Federal Government went into effect, Benjamin Franklin stated that—

Our Constitution is in actual operation; everything appears to promise it will last, but in this world nothing is certain but death and taxes.

The same appearances of promise attended the inauguration of the Polish Constitution. It was drafted here on our own soil. It was devised and intended to last for perpetuity. But its inherent virtue as an instrument of government was destroyed by venal men who were unworthy of its blessings.

Therein lies the pity and the tragedy of the present woeful state of the Polish Constitution.

Governments—

Said the founder of Pennsylvania—like clocks, go from the motion men give them and, as governments are made and moved by men, so by men they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments rather depend upon men than men upon governments.

The successful usurpation of the Government of Poland by men of political immorality leaves her constitution unscathed. The true virtue of Poland is in the body of her people.

When those people shall rise again, as they always have, from the ruins of their nation's conquest, they shall again clothe themselves with the adornments of freedom, justice, and brotherhood under the Polish Constitution.

It is only a matter of time and let us hope it will be soon, when the brave, liberty-loving people of Poland, a deeply religious people, will again regain their freedom and independence.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago it was my privilege in this House to speak on the one hundred and sixteenth anniversary of the adoption of the constitution submitted by King Stanislas Augustus II to the Polish Diet; today we recall the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of this event which lives in the minds and the memory of Poles everywhere. This document embodied the dreams of a great leader—dreams of liberty and democracy for a nation and its people following the liberation of struggling Poland from Prussian and Russian despotism. It is significant to note that this constitution was adopted about 15 years after our immortal Constitution became a reality. It was hailed by the Polish Congress of that day as a master document, and it received the unanimous approval of the Diet. Polish nationalism and Polish democracy had at last been achieved in the minds of the leaders of that day. There was joy and exultation throughout the land. The lights of Warsaw blazoned throughout the night; at last they were free.

It was the hope and dream of King Stanislas and his followers that from this

constitution would come the stability to discourage the aggressive plans of her powerful neighbors. It sought to establish order under law. It held that reform without order was a tragic waste. This was perhaps its greatest promise to the people of Poland.

With powerful and ruthless dictators firmly entrenched on both sides, the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people were all too soon crushed by the second and third partitions in 1793 and 1795. Then, as always, Poland was the victim of its geographical location. A land of fertile plains, with little natural defensive barriers, it soon succumbed to the rolling hordes of the German Empire and Russia. Frederick William and Catherine the Great sent their armies on a tour of devastation and subjugation once again, and Poland lost her freedom and liberty.

In 1918, during World War I, the fate of Poland and other small nations of Europe, was again uppermost in the minds of our diplomats and those of our allies. It was in 1918 that I introduced a resolution to recognize the Polish regiments who joined others in fighting the Hapsburg autocracy, as part of our allied forces, which sacrificed its all in the fight against the Kaiser and his followers in the hope that through the defeat of Imperial Germany the liberty and freedom that Poland was seeking would become a reality.

Knowing that Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm actually controlled the Austrian Army, I had urged President Wilson not to conclude a separate peace with Austria-Hungary because it would not have brought an earlier end to the war as many believed, nor would it have advanced the interest of self-determination and freedom for Poland and other oppressed peoples of Europe. I was proud indeed that I finally succeeded in convincing President Wilson that we should keep our pledge and assurance to these liberty-loving and freedom-seeking peoples by refusing to negotiate a separate peace with Austria-Hungary.

After the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary, I urged, together with Professor Paderewski, Professor Masaryk, and other leaders of small nations, that the United States should demand that autonomy and freedom be given these oppressed nations. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House at that time I was gratified that this was brought about and Poland reunited as a free and independent nation.

In the case of Poland, as in many other instances, history has shown that peace, democracy, and stately order cannot be confined within the borders of any one nation. The peace the people of Poland sought in that day, and the peace the peoples of the world so earnestly pray for today, can only come through a meeting of the minds of leaders in nations the world over. It can never be achieved by wars, bloodshed, slaughter, and devastation. Again, history throughout all the ages has shown that the cruel scars of the hates and enmities engendered by conflict are never healed. Even though treaties are signed providing for the peaceful solution of

problems after war's end, the sores and ugly wounds resulting from these wars suddenly become infected again, and the noble words and efforts of diplomats and statesmen around the peace table become meaningless and the treaties mere scraps of paper.

The great problem facing the world today, as always, is to change the character of dictators whose aggressive designs on weak and struggling nations inevitably result in cataclysms of horror. Difficult as this task might seem, it is not impossible. Here is to be found the basis of American foreign policy today. The United Nations is the one hope of a torn and distressed world to accomplish this end. With all of the set-backs thus far experienced, I feel very strongly that patience and determination will ultimately result in the success of the United Nations in its laudable effort to bring peace and tranquillity among nations, to bring order out of chaos in world affairs, and to end the heartless slaughter and terrible destruction the world is constantly enduring.

Only when real peace is firmly established can the people of Poland and other small nations again enjoy the true freedom, liberty, order, and justice, so clearly outlined in the historic Polish Constitution of 1791. When that day dawns, as I hope and pray it will in the very near future, the people of Poland will again witness the unanimous action of its Diet ordaining and establishing a new constitution worthy of a great people, designed along the same lofty principles of freedom, democracy, and justice for all, laid down so wisely by King Stanislas Augustus II in that eventful year 1781. I earnestly hope and confidently expect when peace becomes a reality that Poland will regain the domain wrested from her and that all her nationals will again be reunited as one in the family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on this anniversary date we recall the great work of this democratic leader as an encouragement and inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of Poland, reminding them that the struggle for peace is unending; it must go on until its full realization is with us all. Let all who believe that people everywhere are entitled to the freedom and liberty which we enjoy, cooperate and aid in every way so that Poland's aspirations, dreams, and hopes may come true and that once again they will become one of the great nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable date in the minds and the hearts of the people of Poland and people of Polish ancestry everywhere in the world. This is the one hundredth and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—the charter of liberty for the people of Poland.

That great nation has been the victim of much bitter suffering and humiliation since Constitution Day in 1791.

Throughout her history she has endured the disaster of military conquest at the hands of more powerful neighbors several times. She is today under the domination of the Soviet Union, and her people today are tasting the bitter dregs of Communist rule.

In company with other countries behind the darkness of the iron curtain, the people of Poland have learned the sorrowful lessons from harsh personal experience that where communism prevails there is no freedom of the body, of the mind, or of the spirit. Her people were among the first to learn that communism is a godless struggle for world dictatorship founded on atheistic materialism.

But even now, as always before when she has been ground under the heel of foreign aggression, Poland may take some measure of comfort in the inspiration of this day on which her constitutional liberties were defined and given effect 160 years ago. The memories of that great event linger on as a basis for the hope and the prayers of Poles for the dignity of freedom and independence.

A nation which produced men with the courage and the will of a Pulaski, a Sobieski, and a Kosciuszko is a nation which will never succumb to the lash of the dictatorship of communism or any other atheistic dogma.

It is a nation which is determined to regain its freedom no matter how long freedom must wait.

Not alone Americans of Polish descent but Americans who admire and respect the yearning of mankind everywhere for dignity and freedom share on this day a feeling of fraternity and kinship with the people of Poland whose fight for freedom may have been slowed down by a ruthless police state, but we take comfort in the knowledge that their fight will go on until it is won.

May God speed that great day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland—May 3, 1791—presents to us the best opportunity for an appraisal of the true meaning of the present tragic plight of Poland.

The following two undisputable facts characterize the present situation:

First, Poland always was and today still remains an essentially western country, a Christian land whose culture, civilization, and attitude were as western in its orientation as those of France, Italy, Spain, and other western European countries.

Second. At the present time, while Poland is subjugated under Communist regime whose Soviet masters are in Moscow, Poland's centuries-old ties with the western culture and with the Christian world have been cut off, against the Nation's will, against its history and tradition, and against its best interest.

Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the best expression of Poland's western way of thinking, Poland's strong intellectual and ideological ties with the

cultured west, as opposed to the then, and still now, barbarian east.

It seems needless to prove that what happened in Warsaw, Poland, on that historic day of May 3, 1791, was but a logical result of the Poles' thinking and feeling along the lines of the then undergoing revolutionary changes in France, and, indeed, in these United States.

The powerful wind that was blowing from the west could not fail to reach Poland. The overthrow of the obsolete and tyrannical French monarchy, the ensuing currents of liberation of the human flesh and soul from dictatorial bondage, the actions undertaken by the revolutionary leaders of this country, have as they indeed must have, influenced the thinking and the conduct of the leaders of Poland.

Although Poland's monarchical system and the elective kings that it installed on Poland's throne, were in many ways much more liberal and certainly less dictatorial than most of the monarchical systems at the time prevailing in Europe—it was, nevertheless, true that a majority of Poland's population, especially the peasant class and the inhabitants of that country's towns and cities, were deprived of any influence on the affairs of state, at that time, before adoption of the liberal constitution of 1791. It is also true, however, that no other country in Europe had, at that time, a more democratic system of government based on a limited constituency.

The adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791, brought Poland into the ranks of the new democracies of the world. Being threatened then—as she was throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—and up to date, unfortunately, by separate or combined efforts of Russia and Germany, regardless of the coloring of the regimes that the two predatory countries might have at their respective helms at any time, Poland has seen fit to enlarge the constituency upon which the Government was based, to give complete equality to all classes of its population, and to make a decisive step on exactly the same way to self-government, that this Nation had chosen under George Washington, assisted by the great son of Poland, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

The numerous provisions of the May 3 constitution include certain basic elements which have retained a lasting value for the Polish nation, as well as a number of valuable, just, and sound decisions.

The greatness of the May 3, 1791, constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system, and that is also the reason why this day marks both the crowning act of regeneration of the spirit of the Polish nation in the second half of the eighteenth century and, also, a testament of the progressive and evolutionary methods with which the Poles entered political life after the temporary downfall of their own state.

In the very forefront of lasting contributions of this constitution we must place the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which sovereignty was also made the primary postulate of

the first constitution of the restored Poland, passed on March 17, 1921. In the 1791 constitution this principle was formulated in the words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation. Three distinct powers shall compose the Government of the Polish nation, according to the present constitution, viz:

1. Legislative power in the states assembled.
2. Executive power in the King and council of inspection.
3. Judicial power in jurisdiction existing, or to be established.

To any Western European, who had been reared in the French ideas, or even more in the age-old parliamentarianism of Britain, or in the principles which have been natural to the United States from their very beginning, this principle is almost a truism, and something natural in itself. But in Eastern and Central Europe it cuts off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared throughout the centuries in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The philosophy of government discernable throughout this Polish Constitution would lead one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Throughout the May 3 constitution runs a philosophy of humanitarianism and tolerance, such as—

We publish and proclaim a perfect and entire liberty to all people, either who may be newly coming to settle, or those who, having emigrated, would return to their native country; and we declare most solemnly, that any person coming into Poland, from whatever part of the world or returning from abroad, as soon as he sets his foot on the territory of the republic, becomes free and at liberty to exercise his industry, wherever and in whatever manner he pleases, to settle either in towns or villages, to form, and rent lands and houses, on tenures and contracts, for as long a term as may be agreed on; with liberty to remain, or to remove, after having fulfilled the obligations he may have voluntarily entered into.

We find in this Polish Constitution, adopted almost contemporaneously with our own Federal Constitution, rule by majority, secret ballot at public elections, and the language relating to religion that—

The same holy religion commands us to love our neighbors, we, therefore, owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently, we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the republic.

Thus, it was on May 3, in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life.

That is why Poles everywhere since that year on May 3, on the anniversary of the adoption of this liberal constitu-

tion, celebrate their national holiday. In observing this day, we are joining Poles all over the world—in establishing spiritual contact with the only country where no celebrations of this national Polish holiday are allowed—namely, in liberated Poland.

Russia and Germany—or Prussia as it was then called—prevented Poland from gaining strength under the new constitution and with the assistance of the then existing Austrian monarchy proceeded to perpetrate the worst crime of the nineteenth century, the occupation and dismemberment of Poland.

The same crime was perpetrated by the same partners—minus Austria, of course—in 1939. And once more, the same crime was perpetrated by the only remaining member of the international criminal gang—Russia, under Stalin this time as in 1939—after the last war in 1945.

It seems improper to sound facetious in discussing problems of such gravity, magnitude and purport, as the problem of Poland. But, one cannot help but feel a little encouraged when one realizes that there is only one member of the international predatory group left—Soviet Russia.

Our President, speaking on behalf of the United States, has stated that—

Our country would not recognize any government imposed on any nation by the forces of any foreign power.

This looking toward a resurrection of a free Poland will find heart in the pledge of the American people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Polish National Constitution.

Every loyal son of Poland, whether in the motherland or living beyond its borders, celebrates this anniversary with patriotic pride. Every loyal friend of the brave and freedom-loving Polish people joins in commemorating this day with the hope that the time is not too far distant when Poland will again become a free and independent nation.

Poland, back through the years, has always fought for liberty and freedom whenever its domain has been encroached upon by powerful aggressor nations. In the recent war Poland was the first nation to take a stand, not only against the Panzer divisions of the Nazis but also against the vicious onslaught of the Soviet tyrant. Poland did not submit meekly against terrific odds as did other nations at the beginning of World War II. As we look back upon the beginning of Hitler's aggression, we remember how Hitler conquered country after country and the world looked with hope that his onslaught would be hampered and delayed. The world will never forget the valiant and brave defense of Warsaw in September of 1939 by the heroic stand of the Polish Army. The heroic Polish people from the beginning of the war battled the invader not only within their own borders but also on every other battle front in Europe until the enemy surrendered. Poland's loss, per capita, was the greatest in human life and with pris-

oners in murderous concentration camps of any nation in that conflict.

Poland carried through and fought on and was deserving of the highest reward for the victory, but today Poland is not free. She is governed by a communistic regime forced upon her by Soviet Russia. The Polish people are not Communists. They believe in free enterprise and freedom of religion. They are a Christian people. The Polish people have defended Christianity for centuries and will continue to do so until the last vestige of atheistic communism is driven from their country.

Poland has a right to demand the restoration of her eastern boundaries as they were in 1939 and her western boundaries permanently fixed on the Oder-Niesse line. This is territory from which she has been robbed and it must be returned.

The Russian betrayal, as it allowed the Nazi overlords to slaughter the Polish people, will be recorded as history's most barbarous duplicity and treachery.

The discovery of the graves of over 5,000 Polish officers near Katyn on April 12, 1943, reveals a new low in international banditry, the like of which has never been surpassed in world history. Over a year and a half ago I called upon the State Department, International Red Cross, and also in a speech on the floor of Congress, demanded that a special investigation be instituted in order to secure concrete and direct evidence to officially determine the responsibility for the massacre at Katyn. In response to this, both of these departments assured me that every effort would be made to directly place the responsibility for this violation of international law regarding captive soldiers.

I am recalling these facts because it is our duty to keep alive in the minds of free nations everywhere the type of criminal intellect which predominates the brain of the present rulers of the communistic Soviet regime. It is evident now that the democratic and free nations of the world must marshal all their forces to stamp out the spread of dictatorial aggression and not repeat the mistakes that were made after World War I when the isolationists got control of our Government and repudiated Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. Had America, the greatest Nation of the world, accepted its responsibilities 30 years ago, aggression by dictators could have been stopped and World War II would have been avoided.

We must now rally behind the United Nations, and it is my earnest hope and belief that the steps that we have taken in Korea to stop aggression, will be the beginning of the age-old effort to successfully outlaw war. No international organization similar to the strength and power of the United Nations has ever been tried in world history before. Let us hope that we have found a solution.

We must follow through. If we do, Stalin will either be crushed from without or overthrown by his own subjects from within. The gallant Polish nation, which has fought so many defensive wars in times past, will again achieve the in-

dependence, the liberty and the peace to which she is entitled. Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United Nations must be ready and on guard for any surprise attack.

The time has now come when every nation in the world which intends to survive, must know that it cannot make agreements with other nations and discard them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone, is to require that Russia withdraw all of her military and civilian forces from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again. The same yardstick applies to other nations under the whiplash of tyranny. The democratic nations wanted peace too much when the war was raging with Japan. That was before the atom bomb appeared on the scene. Unfortunate concessions were made to Russia for her help in the Japanese war theater.

The mistakes made at Yalta 6 years ago today in yielding to the Russians must be corrected and rectified. At that time, our military leaders underestimated our strength. We did not know then that the atom bomb was soon to knock Japan into surrender. Yalta and Tehran and the results of the mistakes incident to those conclaves, will be a threat to world peace until the day comes when the Soviet aggressor retreats behind its own border. Russia has broken its promises—agreements made at Yalta and Tehran should be thrown in the wastebasket.

Where slavery by a dictator exists as it does in Poland, or any other nation who wishes to be free, it stands as a threat to freedom everywhere. The communistic dictatorship will be eventually overthrown in Russia and it is our earnest hope that this will come about from a revolution within. Whether from within or from outside force, Soviet dictatorship of democratic countries cannot continue. Our sacrifices to protect freedom throughout the world are costly, but necessary.

A free and independent Poland will rise again so that Polish Constitution day, May 3, can continue to be a reality.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world today, all Poles and all persons of Polish extraction together with all freedom-loving people pause to commemorate the Polish Fourth of July. One hundred and sixty years ago today, the Polish Constitution was adopted, a very definite step toward the recognition of the basic right of all people to a free and democratic way of life.

The history of the Polish people is a glorious one—it is a record of valor unsurpassed, of courage without fear, of honor without blemish. And so it is fitting today that we recall Poland's magnificent heritage, ever present through the years, that we recall that spirit of Poland which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

It has been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to its native ideals. If this be true, then the Polish people are without peer, for the record they have achieved in resisting the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds stands as a splendid example to people of all races and all creeds.

Through the centuries, Poland has had her great leaders—her Pulaski, her Sobieski and her Kosciuszko—men of extraordinary courage, character, and capabilities. Yet all the great men of Poland, no matter how varied their spheres of influence or how different their fields of endeavor, have inherited several things in common which gave them their reason for being—their love of God and their religion, their love of country, and their burning desire for its eventual liberation.

The heroic stand of Poland in 1939 in the face of aggression by superior force was an example of courage unparalleled in history. When Poland offered the first resistance to the overwhelming strength of Hitler and the Nazi war machine, she inspired the freedom-loving nations of the world and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

Poland's contribution to the success of the allied nations during World War II and the fight of her people to preserve Western civilization as they had on several previous occasions make it incumbent upon us to keep faith with the Polish people now at a time when her long-cherished freedom is once again in chains.

We must continue our efforts to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render all possible assistance to Poland in her underground struggle to break the chains of Russian communism by which she is now surrounded and which threaten to engulf all of Europe.

If we of the United Nations go forward in the spirit of the brave people of Poland, who are resisting by every possible means the domination of Communist Russia and her satellites, it is my conviction that we can build a world where intolerance and aggression are only bitter memories of the past and where the ideals of liberty and justice are adhered to by all nations of the world.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of a great historical event that took place in Poland by the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States.

The lifetime of every nation is marked by certain momentous events. From generation to generation significant anniversaries are observed for the great influence wrought upon the course of history and human relations. The Bastille, the Magna Carta, the Fourth of

July have a counterpart in every country.

To the Poles there is one date which for over a century and a half retains the highest, the most honored place, and is cherished by the entire Polish element throughout the world with unparalleled fervor. It is the 3d of May, when they commemorate the adoption of the constitution by the Commonwealth of Poland in 1791, which took place amid general national rejoicing and patriotic enthusiasm. May I quote at this time a part of that constitution:

Every person, upon coming to this republic from whatsoever parts of the world or one returning to this, the country of his origin, as soon as his foot touches the Polish soil, he is entirely free to indulge in whatsoever enterprise he wishes to enter, in the manner and place of his own choice; that person is free to enter into contact for purchase of property, for work, for rent in whatever manner and for whatever time he himself agrees upon; he is at liberty to settle in the city or in the village; he is free to live in Poland or to return to whatever country he himself chooses after his commitments in Poland which he voluntarily embraced, are duly performed and completed.

This constitution of May 3 abolished restrictions upon the freedom of the individual and gave the Polish nation a democratic form of government. However, due to the aggressiveness of its neighbors, the Polish nation was allowed by a short time in which to enjoy the blessings of its democratic rule. The three powerful neighbors of Poland—Russia, Germany and Austria—were dissatisfied with the reforms introduced in Poland by this constitution. They conspired among themselves, and partitioning Poland, put an end to the freedom and democracy of the Polish nation. It was not until much later, that, thanks to the efforts of one of our presidents, Woodrow Wilson, it regained its freedom and independence.

With almost 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found the realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

The Poles have a deep, natural love of freedom; it is something so vital in their soul that they fight and die for it wherever it is attacked, or where it is to be gained or ransomed at the cost of wounds and blood. Upon the pages of American history their names are honorably recorded for their contribution to the independence of this country. Kosciuszko and Pulaski serve not only as a classic evidence, but shall forever remain revered national heroes of Poland and the United States.

Confronted with tremendously adverse and crucial conditions of the present day, the Polish Nation looks expectantly to the magnanimity and democracy of the United States for assistance in dispelling the yoke of aggression enforced upon her by outside influences, so that she may restore independence and take her place among the free nations of the world.

It is, therefore, just and reasonable to assure the people of Poland on the day of their national holiday that the United States shall not fail to extend them friendly support nor relax in vigilance over the execution of justice. Our great and prosperous republic bears proudly the banner of humane policies. It has drawn universal respect as a decided enemy of injustice and enslavement. It will not, it cannot, add disappointment to the present fate of Poland.

It is impossible today to recall the Constitution of May 3 without comparing the events of the eighteenth century with what has taken place in Poland.

After years of unfortunate appeasement of Germany, during the dark days of September 1939, it was the Polish Nation which first took up arms against the evil forces of violence and aggression. The events of war developed in such a way that many of us subconsciously forget the part that Poland played in World War II. We forget the ideals and the principles, which Poland rose to defend, and which are being fought for today by almost the entire world. We forget that the chief slogan at the outbreak of war was the struggle for individual freedom, the defense of the weaker against the stronger, the struggle for justice above evil.

In the opening days of World War II, President Roosevelt called Poland an inspiration to all nations, because Poland alone dared defy the Germans in their ruthless challenge of those freedoms and democratic liberties championed by Poland.

It was but a short-lived appellation. Poland, that inspiration to all nations, was ignominiously sold down the Soviet river and today it is languishing in the throes of Russian forced slavery.

Today Poland's sons, scattered through the various parts of the globe, dare not place their foot upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals, uncertain of their property and life in the land of their origin because Poland's political life is dominated by secret police and puppet agents of Soviet Russia who control its political life.

The third of May has ceased to be an official Polish national holiday in Poland by decree of the present regime in Poland. But the third of May remains a Polish national holiday in the hearts of all true Poland, and in all centers in the United States where Poles or Americans of Polish extraction live. In numerous Polish national homes, the Polish flag hangs proudly on this day, side by side with the American Stars and Stripes. Thousands of people listen attentively to the voices of the past. They hope that there will again be a Poland which in the spirit of the constitution of May 3 will be independent once more and free from foreign invaders.

On this day, the third of May, the hearts and minds of the American people are as one with the Polish nation, linked by indissoluble bonds of friendship with the United States. For the principles of the 3d of May constitution are in line with the ideals on which the American Nation bases its existence and the realization which America desires for all the people of the world.

So on this day, the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the constitution of the 3d of May of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support; to cheer them; to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word. Long live Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of an idea—the idea of modern government based on democratic principles.

In the eighteenth century Poland, extending from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea, was still a large country, the third in size among European states. But she was growing weaker internally, owing to the exhausting war fought in the seventeenth century and the lack of a strong executive. In 1764 Catherine II of Russia imposed on the electors her own candidate, Stanislaus Poniatowski, who was the last king of Poland. He was entirely under the influence of Russia, who did all she could to maintain chaos in the country. An attempt at resistance was made and a military league, the Confederation of Bar, to drive out the Russian troops from Poland, was formed under the leadership of Casimir Pulaski, who later became one of the heroes of the American Revolution. The Confederation broke, and in 1772 the first partition of Poland took place. Prussia annexed Pomorze, that is the Baltic coast, Russia, the eastern provinces, and Austria, the southeastern parts.

Deeply shaken by this disaster, the Polish people started stupendous internal reforms. The first Ministry of Public Education in the world was created in Poland in 1773, the treasury and army were reorganized, and a new constitution was voted on May 3, 1791. That day has since been the Polish national holiday. The constitution of May 3 established the foundations of modern government on democratic principles. At that time only England, France, and Poland had a liberal constitution in Europe, all the other countries being ruled by despotic regimes. The autocrats of Russia and Prussia called the democratic Polish constitution anarchy and annexed further provinces of Poland in 1793. Thereupon General Kosciuszko issued a proclamation calling the Polish nation to arms. After a few initial victories Kosciuszko was defeated and Poland lost her freedom in 1795.

The partition of Poland—

Says Lord Eversly, the English historian—

although remote and indirect, was the essential cause of the World War. The partition

overthrew the European equilibrium and introduced the victory of violence and the principle: Might is right.

Throughout the nineteenth century the Polish Nation never lost hope of regaining independence. During the Napoleonic era, General Dabrowski formed Polish legions to fight on the side of France in Italy. It was then that the song Poland Is Not Yet Lost was composed, later to become the national anthem of reborn Poland. Napoleon intended to reestablish the Polish State and created its nucleus, the Duchy of Warsaw. After Napoleon's fall the Congress of Vienna in 1815 assigned the major part of Poland to Russia. But the Tsar exercised such tyranny that the Polish Nation rose in 1830 to free itself from Russian bondage. The insurrection was suppressed after a year's war and the last shadow of freedom was taken away from Poland.

In 1863 the Poles rose again. A secret revolutionary government was formed in Warsaw with Romuald Traugutt at its head. But the insurrection was eventually suppressed with great difficulty; tens of thousands of Poles were executed, Traugutt and others were seized and deported to Siberia. Henceforth Poland was treated with the utmost ruthlessness, no efforts being spared to Russify the Polish Nation.

POLAND, TOO, HAD ITS KOREA

One could list the events in Poland from 1863 through the present time, including World War I and World War II.

Suffice it to say that, like the people of Korea, the people of Poland have been split by artificial means which were not successful. The thirty-eighth parallel in Korea is a travesty on the dignity of a courageous people. Let us hope that on this day, we have seen the last of parallels, Curzon lines, and so forth and that one day, even Ireland may be undivided. Covenants may separate people, but the heartbeat in every man, woman, and child makes mockery of covenants not founded on the right of a people to be governed by their consent.

Poland is not yet lost, and in our lifetime, I pray that she will again know freedom, in the true spirit of Woodrow Wilson, her benefactor.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, millions of Poles all over the world celebrate today the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the May 3 constitution of 1791. This historic document was adopted by the freedom-loving people of Poland on May 3, 1791, less than 3 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. The first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation, it resembles our own Constitution in many respects. It recognized the fundamental principle of democracy that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." It guaranteed freedom of religion. It adopted the principle of division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish people are proud of their constitution. It is an immortal testa-

ment to the political genius of a people who during the past 150 years have enjoyed only two decades of national freedom.

The Polish Constitution is to the Polish people their charter of liberty and is comparable to the Magna Carta for the English and the Declaration of Independence for our own beloved America. It is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should set aside a portion of its deliberations on this, the great national feast day of the people of Poland, and pay tribute to the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. The people of America have ever been grateful for the services rendered during the dark days of the Revolution by the brave Polish patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the father of American cavalry, who gave his life for the cause of freedom while leading his troops into action during the Battle of Savannah. Count Pulaski was a tried and trusted friend of our own immortal George Washington, as was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who likewise served under Washington.

Today the casualty lists from Korea are full of Polish names of our brave soldiers of Polish descent whose magnificent record of patriotism and sacrifice does honor to our country, as well as to the memory of their gallant ancestors, like Pulaski, Kosciuszko, Karge, Krzysnowski, and others, who fought and died for America's noble ideals.

Many thousands of my constituents are of Polish descent. I have known and admired them for many years. I have shared their sorrow when Poland was partitioned by Hitler and Stalin, and I sympathize with them with all my heart, knowing how their families and friends now suffer under the Red yoke.

What I desire to say was well expressed many years ago by George Brandes, who said:

Old Field Marshal Moltke one day said that, in a book he had read about Poland, he had been most pleased by this sentence: "We do not love Poland as we love Germany or France or England, but as we love freedom"; a very curious remark from the lips of one whom one would not suspect of loving freedom overmuch.

We love Poland as we love freedom. For what is it to love Poland but to love freedom, to have a deep sympathy with misfortune, and to admire courage and enthusiasm? Poland is a symbol—a symbol of all that the best of the human race have loved, and for which they have fought. In Poland the contrasts of human life are found in bold relief; here the cosmos is concentrated as in an essence.

Everywhere in Europe where there has been any fighting, the Poles have taken part in it, on all battlefields, on all the barricades. They have sometimes been mistaken in their views of the enterprises to which they lend their arms; but they believed that they were fighting for the good of humanity; they regarded themselves as the bodyguard of freedom, and still look on everyone that fights for freedom as a brother.

Poland, in the historical development of relations, has become synonymous with our hope or our illusion as to the advance of our age in culture. Its future coincides with the future of civilization.

In paying tribute to those sons and daughters of Poland who died for freedom and Christianity, and those who

now continue in the noble tradition of the cross held high by the White Eagle over Poland's martyred soil, I am going to change Dante's inscription over the entrance to the Inferno which reads: "Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate"—Abandon all hope you who enter here.

To the Poles in Poland and all over the world I say: "Have hope you who now suffer and fight. Have hope that Poland will be freed to be a Christian, free, independent and happy land in a new peaceful world. If there is no hope for you, then there is no hope for the world."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution Day. To all Poles this day has the celebrated meaning of our American Fourth of July.

Because Poland's history goes back more than 1,000 years—a history filled with glory and sacrifice, one asks why have the Poles added such great significance to May 3, 1791? The reasons are many. The signing of the constitution on this day meant the end of the nobility, which at the time was the ruling class of Poland. It meant that the oppressed masses of people were emancipated. This document meant that Poland was to have a constitution modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier, and provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. It meant that the Polish Diet—equivalent to our Congress—was to consist of two chambers: First, the Chamber of Deputies; and, second, the Chamber of Senators, with the King at its head as presiding authority. To the Poles it meant the guaranty of religious toleration; rule by the majority of citizens; secret ballots at public elections; personal security. Poland was no longer to be a government of a few, but a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This was the substance of the constitution which was approved on May 3, 1791, by the Polish Diet and Stanislaus August Poniatowski, Poland's last King. It was accepted by all Poles as a symbol of democracy and liberty. This document became a guide for Poland's future.

Progressive thinkers throughout Europe hailed it as a significant step in establishing a modern political system. But the recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in the constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides.

Poland fell in 1795 and was partitioned, but the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people. The constitution brought moral victory for millions of Poles who became infused with a new patriotism and love of liberty. For 127 years, the Polish people thought, planned, and plotted for their national independence. Their struggle for independence never ceased. The Poles tried to free themselves many times through

insurrections which failed. Even though all of their uprisings were unsuccessful, and many Poles lost their lives, the cause of freedom was never lost. The May 3 constitution served as a beacon of political freedom and democratic government.

From the role of living in bondage, the people of Poland were restored as a republic in 1918. The dreams of Polish patriots for 127 years were realized. The new government was set up, with a few technical changes, along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791. Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation. Her people enjoyed the privilege of democratic living. However, the happy, glowing picture of a free and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II. First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

During this second world conflict, the Poles, inspired by the ideals of freedom and love of liberty, fought bravely on all battle fronts—in Africa, England, France, Italy. They fought at Narvik, on the Maginot Line, and at Monte Cassino. Millions of Poles gave their lives so that other people in the world might be free. They fought not only in defense of their own freedom, but also in the defense of the threatened freedom of the whole world. The western democracies assured the Polish nation repeatedly that its great sacrifices will not be in vain, and it will regain independence and freedom. The Polish nation believed in these assurances.

Unfortunately, the victorious end of World War II did not bring the richly deserved and longed-for freedom and independence to the Polish nation. Surely, freedom and independence were earned by the Poles for fulfilling a duty beyond glory. The sacrifices borne by Poland, as our ally, were not surpassed by any nation, yet she was denied her rightful place among the peoples of the world.

For this, the western democracies must bear the responsibility—since the promises given to Poland have not been kept. Regretfully, I must confess that the present administration has been a party to the betrayal of Poland at Yalta and Tehran. It agreed to turn Poland over to the Soviet sphere of interest, to Soviet bondage and complete abandonment by the western democracies.

The Polish nation under the Communist regime knows full well the tyranny of a dictator. I shall enumerate some of the changes which have taken place since the Politburo took over in Poland: the introduction of the Soviet slave-labor system for the workers; the beginning of the collectivization of agriculture; the placing at the head of the regime, and the army, well known and experienced international Communist agents; the speeding up of the Communist indoctrination of the youth; the open fight against the church; the complete economic dependence on the state.

Such is the reward of a once proud nation which was the first to take up

arms in the cause of freedom and independence. Surely, we cannot abandon the hopes and aspirations of a freedom-loving nation. The present sad plight of the Polish people can be traced back to the mistakes made by this administration when, at Yalta and Tehran, the Western Powers left Poland to the fate of Russian domination. Russia, with impunity, violated all her obligations toward Poland, and now ruling over Poland indivisibly, prepares Poles as cannon fodder for the armed clash with western democracies in its endeavors to force communism throughout the entire world. In the name of justice, is it not time for us to rectify the wrongs of Yalta and Tehran by invalidating these pacts of appeasement?

We must be ever mindful, especially on this anniversary, of the promises of our allies concerning the Polish nation, which are, to guarantee a free, strong, and independent Poland. In formulating our policies to eradicate communism, we cannot forget this unfortunate nation which is jailed behind the iron curtain.

The Polish people are not without hope. They are Poles, cheerful, hopeful, idealistic as their forefathers have been, imbued with patriotism and a deep love of freedom. They are mindful of the spirit of their constitution of May 3. Today, the torch of freedom is burning in the hearts of every Pole and with our help and God's blessings they will not rest until the day of emancipation is at hand. Deliverance of Poland from the communistic yoke will once again give the Polish people an opportunity to live in a land of freedom and independence as was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution which was adopted 160 years ago today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to follow in these exercises my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] who has just spoken to us so eloquently. I came to Congress with Mr. SADLAK and I know how close to his heart have been the matters of which he has spoken today and how diligently he has pursued them.

Each year we celebrate our Fourth of July with parades, firecrackers, and political speeches at picnics. Because we are a free people, united under one flag, we show our exuberant rejoicing in any fashion we please. But today the Polish people can only sit by their hearths and silently recall the days when they too were free and independent and united, not menaced by the constant threat of a knock on the door at midnight.

Just as the signing of the Declaration of Independence signifies to us the beginning of our determination as a united people to be free from tyranny and foreign rule, so the Polish Constitution Day, May 3, has the same deep meaning for all people of Polish origin, whether at home or abroad.

In 1791, 160 years ago, the Polish king Stanislaus Augustus II presented to the Diet this precious document, setting forth widespread reforms and granting greater individual liberty for all his people. It was adopted by acclamation,

and that night lights burned in all the houses as the capital city celebrated the beginning of its newly won freedoms. Unlike surrounding countries, the Poles achieved these rights by peaceful means, without the necessity of revolting against despotic rulers. The Polish people may well be proud of the fact that their liberty was an inherited tradition, the natural evolution of centuries of self-respect and regard for the rights of others.

Poland's enjoyment of its constitution was tragically short-lived since after 2 years the armies of foreign conquerors engulfed it. At one fell swoop, Poland lost its independence, constitution, civil order, and justice which had been carefully cultivated and preserved during four centuries of progress.

But the will to resist was not lost, and through the intervening years of war and slavery, with only brief intervals of peace and independence, the hope of eventual liberation and self-determination has sustained the Polish nation in their fierce resistance to enslavement or resignation to that dire plight.

The history of Poland holds for all freedom-loving peoples a profound moral lesson. Poland's is the tragedy of a rich, fertile country, surrounded by voracious, powerful neighbors, from whom they are protected by no natural barriers.

In this country, we occasionally tend to think that our freedom and our present national strength are exclusively the result of our own unique virtues. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our infant democracy came to maturity in a country with almost unlimited natural resources and wealth, surrounded and protected from hostile countries by thousands of miles of ocean over which no trespasser could attack. So we do well to remember that the desire for liberty is not enough. Independence without the means to defend it is a hollow possession on this earth today.

With each passing day, the obstacles of space and weather are being overcome by human resourcefulness, and with this progress, our natural defenses lose their effectiveness. We can only hope, as we review the inspiring history of Poland under the most bleak and terrible ordeals, that should we ever be reduced to similar circumstances, we would strive with equal heroism and determination for our Nation's eventual freedom and independence as this small nation has done.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States often think of Eastern Europe as a part of the world having little in common with the West; an area where the population is accustomed to despotism and neither knows nor cares for anything else.

This view may or may not be true for some countries in the East. It is certainly not true for Poland. Whereas Russia looks back on a thousand years of despotic regimes, one after another, and the German-Austrian Empire evolved a very elaborate system of absolutism, Poland, between these two powerful neighbors, was one of the first coun-

tries in Europe to have a parliament and a bill of rights. True, we do not find in Poland a long-established democratic tradition in the modern western sense. But this is not due to a lack of democratic tendencies among the people as expressed in their institutions. On the contrary, in the sixteenth century, Poland already had a National Diet which controlled the King's power and regarded the unanimity principle as the cornerstone of civil liberties. Every delegate had the "liberum veto" which enabled him to stop the whole legal procedure in much the same way as in the Continental Congress of the 13 American colonies. There was not too little democratic spirit in Poland, rather too much of it. Polish individualism often endangered the interests of the whole country. It led, unfortunately, to the division of the country by its powerful neighbors. At the time when in North America as well as in Western Europe democratic tendencies were being legally consolidated and organized, Poland slipped from the main stream of political development.

For 150 years, Poland ceased to exist as an independent nation. Russia, Germany, and Austria tried vainly to depolondize the provinces where it had stood. After the first partition, in spite of the threatening neighbors, the Polish Diet worked for 4 years, without a break, on the project of a constitution which was ratified on May 3, 1791. This was the foundation on which the hope of freedom and further democratic development continued to rest during the dark decades of national oblivion.

It proved to be a hope that even the ruthless methods of suppression of the Germans and Russians failed to extinguish. Polish patriots fled to Western Europe and to the United States. They fought for American, Greek, Italian independence, hoping that by serving the general cause of human freedom, they would eventually help their own country to resume its place among the free nations.

Polish civilization and way of life, though Slavic, has always had its strong and inalienable ties with the West. The Polish people for example, still cling to their Roman Catholic faith despite all efforts to destroy it.

Today in Poland, a new, wholesale effort at Russianization is being made—all the more ruthless, since Poland is now cut off from the Western World. But the people who, between two partitions of their country were able to work for 4 years on a constitution that established the basis for further democratic evolution in Poland, will not yield to terrorism. The Poles have often been disillusioned in their hopes. Nevertheless, they still look to the west, and especially to the United States for inspiration. Here, they see achieved their ideal of independence. If we do not break faith with that nation whose sons have contributed so much to our own country, their hope for a rebirth of freedom will one day be realized.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Polish leaders, inspired by our war for

independence and the rights and privileges granted to our people under our constitution, promoted a new constitution for the Polish people, under which they obtained the rights they are now being denied. Their constitution was one of the most liberal and democratic documents of its day.

Today, as we again commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are forced to admit that little progress has been made toward helping Poland and the other enslaved nations, to throw off the yoke of their oppressors.

The Polish people have been among the most ardent and courageous fighters for the rights granted to them under the constitution. Their history is replete with stories of their heroic sacrifices for their freedom and independence. And even today, the consecration, endurance, ingenuity and bravery of the Poles in the underground service, is almost unbelievable.

Enemies may conquer their country, but they can not conquer their spirit. These unconquerable people have made themselves the symbol of indomitable national will. If ever a nation, by sacrifice and courage, earned the right to resurrection, it is Poland.

By our economic and financial assistance to the free European countries, we are helping them to rebuild their economies and to strengthen their opposition to communism. By our efforts, with other democratic nations of the world, to prevent the spread of communism in Korea, we are helping tremendously to build up the morale of the enslaved nations, and the nations in danger of enslavement by the Communists.

May the day soon come when the freedom envisioned by the writers of the Polish constitution and for which the people of that nation have so valiantly fought and died, may be an established fact.

It is my fervent hope that through the efforts of the United Nations, it will soon be possible to find a way to restore to Poland and the other nations now behind the iron curtain, their freedom and independence, so that they may again take their places among the democratic nations of the world and enjoy the rights and privileges to which all men are entitled.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I arise before this great body as an American that loves his country and for what stands. My main reason for arising here on this 3d of May is to draw a parallel of what may happen in this country of ours if we are not careful. A review of Poland's history during the time we were fighting for our liberty may, I sincerely hope, will help to bring out the kind of a war we were fighting the last few years and are fighting today. It is not a war of armies but a war of demoralization.

During the crucial last quarter of the eighteenth century, when this great Nation of ours was being born, when the very foundations were being laid for its future might and glory, almost half

around the globe a Christian nation was being murdered by its greedy neighbors.

In the course of three consecutive partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795 the Royal Republic of Poland was first overrun and then completely dismembered and deprived of its independence for 123 years.

Americans question why do we think and talk of these far-off events today? Why do we in the United States of America commemorate the Polish Third of May 1791 Constitution? While in the course of history many nations had lived, flourished and then were crushed by their stronger neighbors, it seems to me that today more than ever we have not only to pause for a short while but we should ponder and seriously reflect on all the circumstances and many cases preceding these fateful events. As strange and even incredible as it may seem, some of the very factors which had largely contributed to Poland's fall, more than one and a half centuries ago, continue to exist and to cast their shadows not merely on the life of single nations but of the whole world including our own United States of America.

There were many reasons why, after over 800 years of existence as one of the pillars of liberty, law, and western civilization in Eastern Europe, Poland was wiped off the map of the old continent. Her intents were like ours—to live in peace. Several generations of historians wrote volumes of scholarly books on the subject searching for and finding many causes of the collapse of the Polish State, despite its great reforms realized in the 3d of May constitution.

Today, however, it is particularly proper and fitting to draw the attention of the public of our country to one of these causes often mentioned, though not always sufficiently emphasized by many historians and political thinkers.

The life of the Polish Nation, ever since the beginning of the fifteenth century, and particularly since its union with the grand duchy of Lithuania in the latter part of the sixteenth century, the whole existence of the Polish Commonwealth was based on political and religious freedom, on national and racial tolerance. For over three centuries its elected kings were not autocratic monarchs but rather chief executives, whose personal rule was restricted, controlled, and checked by statutes of law; royal privileges signed by the king elected by the will of the electors—the gentry—organized in provincial dietines and the central diet called sejm or parliament. This gave considerable measure of personal liberty to a much greater portion of the country's population at that time than in the majority of contemporary European nations.

But the very same traditions of power based on law, of free open debate, of equalitarian democracy and liberty were the source of Poland's weakness, they having been continuously exploited and abused by its expansionist neighbors, particularly by the Czarist then imperial Russia and the militaristic Prussia, as the always willing follower and accomplice of Moscow and St. Petersburg in spoliation of freedom-loving peoples of Eastern Europe.

Before Poland was partitioned in the end of the eighteenth century the Tsarist autocratic Russia true to its deep-rooted centuries-long tradition of subversion, spying, and conquest from within was buying with favors and gold influential personalities, particularly among Polish aristocracy and a few bankrupt, ambitious, or irascible individuals among the gentry, to put their personal freedoms to work for the benefit of Russian despots and against the very existence of Poland as an independent state.

One is stricken today with amazement upon finding how little actual military power was used by Russia in the conquest of the eighteenth century Poland and how much effort, skill, and energy was applied by Russia's rulers and their able subordinates to weaken, sap, and destroy its victim from within, before the final blow was delivered from without.

The whole length of the eighteenth century not just one but all Russian despots, particularly Peter the Great, Peter the Third, and Catherine the Second, through their ambassadors in Warsaw, their agents and spies, often recruited among the best families of the nation, progressively and systematically strangled its independence, putting on the royal throne in Warsaw their followers the hated Saxon princes or controlling the whole reign of the last King of Poland, Stanislaus August Poniatowski.

Having expanded in Asia beyond any limits of justifiable needs they turned toward hated and disdained Europe and first of all against Poland as the nearest to Russia's outpost of western civilization. When after his gallant participation in our Revolutionary War Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko organized in 1794, a truly popular uprising against Russian domination of Poland, his troops captured the files of the Czarist Embassy in Warsaw. It was then disclosed that for years some 110 leading personalities in the country had been on the Russian payroll, not counting swarms of lesser officials who drew from the Embassy regular monthly salaries.

Over 160 years have passed since those fateful years but the Russian methods on the international scene have remained true to their basic form. Only the insatiable appetite of Moscow's rulers has since grown immensely. At present they are out not to subjugate a weaker neighbor country, they openly declare that they would not settle for less than the whole world, and the whole human race. Then it was Poland, Lithuania, and Baltic shore, now it is the whole of Asia and Europe, and as their final objective this country of ours. At that time they were buying Saxon kings, aristocrats and other influential personalities; today using the slogans of international communism as a timelier disguise they attack the most crucial segments of our very existence and of our security, that is in our foreign affairs and our atomic secrets.

It is shuddering to think what tremendous results have the Kremlin masters achieved in these two fields since the end of World War II: what immeasurable and invaluable services did they get from the Canadian spies, Hisses, Remingtons, and their influential protectors, from

Fuchses, Golds, Greenglasses, and Coplons of whom we know and from hordes of others we shall never even hear about.

The signally Russian tradition of spying, subversion and boring from within, of sapping the enemy's security has achieved during these few last years the results which must make certain heads in the Kremlin turn with glee and satisfaction. With the Communists and fellow-travelers the world over securely harnessed to the vehicle of the contemporary Russian imperialists, today have accomplished now in the matter of months what had taken scores of years and generations of spies or agents, their predecessors, the Russian Czars in the 18th century.

These, gentlemen, are the few reflections which came to my mind when thinking on the present-day significance of the events that took place at the time when the brave people of Poland were sold out. The Russian communistic mind today is the same as it was then, except that now it is more experienced. We shall always be at war as long as there exists a communistic government. I also want to assure the people of the world that as long as Poles live on this earth their hopes of freedom shall never die.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is Polish Constitution Day. Year after year during my incumbency I have stood in the well of the House to take part in this very appropriate observance. I can recall when Polish Constitution Day was a happier day.

I have been briefed repeatedly on the plight of the Poles by my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. I was briefed on their sufferings during the midst of the war by their great leader, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, when we broke bread under the dome of this very Capitol. I saw Polish soldiers fighting side by side with American soldiers for liberty, overseas, during World War II. I am proud to say that I have thousands and thousands of people of Polish extraction living in my congressional district, builders of America.

What can we do to inspire the liberty-loving people of Poland besides giving lip service on this very important anniversary? For one thing, we can demand the formal repudiation of the infamous Yalta agreement, which sold them down the river.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 represents a day in history when in 1791, shortly after the first partition of Poland, the Polish Diet issued a constitution which was one of the most advanced documents of its time. Today, around the world, people are commemorating this historical event, except in the home country of Poland, now controlled by Communist Russia.

There is an old Polish saying: "Wherever beats a Polish heart, wherever flows Polish blood, there is Poland."

This old saying tells us much about Poland's history of a fierce and proud

people whose country was often invaded and even obliterated from the map, but whose will to live as a free and independent nation could never be crushed. The Polish desire to live a way of life marked by freedom of speech, religion, and of Government has never died.

With the first partition of Poland the Polish patriots went into exile and, though many of them knew they would never again see their homeland, they did not tire of working for a united Poland. They told Poland's story abroad and sought help among other freedom-loving nations to liberate Poland.

In 1939, when Poland was the first country to literally die for her principles of religious and personal freedom, her patriots fled again and joined the Allies. They fought in Western Europe, in Africa, and thousands of them died for their beliefs at Monte Cassino in Italy. Then there is the sad story of the 10,000 Polish officers who fled to the Russians only to be brutally and wantonly massacred by these butchers at Katyn Forest, just outside of Smolensk.

During World War II no allied country suffered the horrors of war as much as Poland. She lost one-fifth of her population, and Warsaw became the most completely destroyed city in Europe. No allied country could boast of a more active or more effective underground. But Poland had much to fight and die for. Polish civilization, though Slavic, always pointed to the west and her finest sons, poets, and patriots sought and looked for help from the western allies. Poland's acceptance of Christianity in the western, Roman Catholic form, opposed all attempts to convert them to Russian orthodoxy.

Then here, in my estimation, enters the great tragedy of Poland. She looked to England and to America for salvation. And what did she receive? The betrayal at Yalta, where the bungled foreign policy of our present administration first manifested itself when, with Alger Hiss as one of our advisers, we divided the countries of our allies, Poland and China, without even consulting them. President Truman, at the Potsdam Conference, instead of repudiating this infamous sell-out, went along with the Russians as he said in his report to the Nation:

The question of Poland was a most difficult one. Certain compromises about Poland had already been agreed upon at the Crimea (Yalta) Conference. They obviously were binding upon us at Berlin (Potsdam).

What compromises they were—no more government of their choosing; no more freedom of speech; no religious beliefs, except to follow the materialistic beliefs of atheistic Russian communism.

What a sorry spectacle. Poland, a country which offered herself on the altar of freedom, is further punished and deserted by an unrealistic foreign policy which has succeeded in bringing defeat out of victory and bringing us world war III.

So shameful was our foreign policy that it had to be kept a secret for a long time from the American public. Even our Ambassador to Poland, 1944-47, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, said that he "was not advised by his own Government of the

commitments which had been made and were being made with respect to Poland."

Some day we in America will right the wrongs done to Poland and she will rise again, glorious and free, and we, too, will be able to hold our heads high, knowing that justice has prevailed for Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, history shows us that some of the greatest achievements of humanity were produced in times of crisis and stress. When challenged by fate, time and time again mankind has awakened from slumber, stood up, and answered the challenge. At times these achievements did not, for the time being, repel the impending wave of tragedy. At all times, however, they remained in the minds of man, and on the pages of mankind's history, much longer than any temporary misfortune, their presence enriching our heritage and their remembrance offering an inspiring example to be followed through years to come.

It was during a time of stress, when the kingdom of Poland was plagued by need for national unity, for governmental and civil reforms, and beset by greedy neighbors, that its citizens produced one of the remarkable documents of our civilization, the constitution of May 3, 1791. Although this constitution did not bring into the world any startling innovations, since the principles on which it was based were already being put into effect in the New World and on the strife-torn French soil, the peaceful manner in which it was brought into existence, and the manner in which it had survived to this day, were indeed remarkable, and set an example for the world to follow.

One of the very unusual occurrences in the history of mankind, and a factor which we should today bear in mind, is the fact that, through the years which followed the adoption of their famous constitution, the people of Poland remained true to the principles which it embodied. Although their country was partitioned by their greedy neighbors, and although they were subjected, in the course of the century that followed, to constant attempts at forceful russification, they abided by their heritage.

This is an important factor, for it gives us the assurance that the people of Poland, who are today again subjected to oppression, will not surrender their minds and hearts to the Communist teachings but, rather, by continuing their attachment to the principles of their constitution, will play an important part in the global struggle with the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, from the time of her national conception, Poland was a part of the Western World. Christianity, which had its roots in Rome, reigned in her lands. Respect for the dignity of man, parliamentary form of government, freedom of religion, and other human liberties, constituted an integral part of her historical heritage from the earliest times.

For that reason, Poland today represents a weak link in the chain of Com-

munist domination. Through this link we will be able, when the day for it arrives, to penetrate Soviet defenses and start a process which will bring about the deterioration of the Communist empire, depriving it of its strength.

Before that day comes, however, we have a primary job on our hands—a job of stopping the Communist forces from spreading their domination over any additional peoples and any additional areas of the world. We have been doing this job. We have thwarted Soviet designs on Greece; we have strengthened Turkey and Iran; we have saved Italy and France from being destroyed from within by the Communists; we have—and will continue to—aid the Nationalist forces of China; and today we are helping to repel Communist aggression in Korea.

This is the first step in our struggle with the Communist forces; to succeed in this endeavor, the free nations of the world have to work together. Our country has provided the leadership and the means for achieving that goal. By giving food to those who need it, and by giving arms to those who want to defend themselves, we have molded the free nations of the world into a unit which is determined to stop Soviet aggression wherever it may strike.

After we succeed in this primary effort and surround the Soviet empire with a wall of steel, we shall turn to those nations which are today under Communist domination and aid those which want to free themselves of the yoke which has been imposed upon them. The success of this second step will depend, in a large part, on the peoples of the nations concerned—nations which want to be free.

But what must these people—the people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and of other enslaved nations—do in the meantime? They must keep the principles of freedom and democracy alive in their hearts; they must prevent the indoctrination of their children in the theory and practice of dialectical materialism of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin; they must wait, and prepare themselves for the day on which they will be able to regain their freedom.

Will they wait so long? I do not think so. One cannot measure, however, the suffering of mankind in days, months, or years. It must be measured in terms of the goal for which we are striving. If a free world—a world in which all nations shall determine their destiny in accordance with the just desires of their people; in which freedom of religion, freedom of opinion, and freedom from oppression shall reign; in which peace and liberty, not enslavement, shall be the rule—is worth waiting for, then the suffering and sacrifices which we must undergo today become endurable.

The free nations of the world are determined to achieve that goal. To achieve it, they shall need the help of the people of Poland, and the people of other nations which want to be free. The people of Poland, I am certain, will give us that help. They know what suffering is; they know what enslavement is; but they also know how to survive, and, above all, they shall remain true to their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to go back into history to show that the indomitable spirit of the Polish people will not be killed by their Communist oppressors. The world knows how strong that spirit is. The world remembers how bravely the Poles fought during the last war, not only on their home soil, but in France, in England, and in other areas of the world where democracy fought totalitarianism on the field of battle. The Polish names on the graves on Monte Cassino, on the beaches of Normandy, and wherever freemen fought, tell their own tale.

The sacrifices and the courage of the Polish people in the last war have no parallel in history. Their endurance is almost beyond description. Through the centuries, the people of Poland have endured oppression, enslavement, and the tragedies which wars bring, with the hope that they would some day live in peace and freedom among the nations of the world. History would forever condemn us, if we were to fail to aid them in attaining that goal.

It is for us, the people of America, to rededicate ourselves today to the task of aiding the people of those nations which were our true friends and allies in two world wars, in this dark hour of their need. We must rectify our apparent error in placing faith in the power which later violated our trust and proved to be an international thief. The negotiations which we undertook with that power during and immediately after World War II never attained the status of treaties, since they were never confirmed by our Senate. Since they have been violated by a party to the agreement—Soviet Russia—we should not give these negotiations any further recognition.

Mr. Speaker, in the remembrance of the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791, and in the examples of the invincible courage and will of the Polish people, we should draw inspiration today—just as the people of Poland draw inspiration and courage from them. And we should let the world know our conviction—the conviction that, with God's help, Poland and the rest of the world shall be free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in rendering tribute to the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Polish constitution. The 3d of May has been a national holiday in the hearts of the Polish people since the year 1791, when that country gave to the world the most democratic constitution to be found in all Europe. The yoke of foreign aggression to which that country has been subjected at various periods in her history has failed to crush her free spirit. The tragic years of Poland's present bondage will be an inspiration for future generations of Poles to carry on with that indomitable spirit that has brought that country through so many trying situations in the past.

Poland has always fought tyranny and international immorality. She has always supported every expression of international morality, and in that spirit

she aligned herself with the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms.

What did that Atlantic Charter say? Let me quote three points to which those who signed that charter committed their respective nationals:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.
3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

These, in plain language, are the first three points in that charter. The United States was a signator to that pact. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics endorsed these objectives and became a signator on January 1, 1942. The freedom-loving people of Poland accepted this charter as a guaranty that the spiritual rebirth and the principles of freedom to which they had dedicated their lives on May 3, 1791, would be restored to them when the ravages of World War II had reached its end, and the last drop of blood had been spilled. They had earned the right to such expectations. For had they not continued to brave Hitler's power after their country had been desolated? Had they not fought gallantly on when their people were in chains? Had they not made the same sacrifices on the altar of human decency and liberty as the soldiers of other lands including our own fair sons? And finally had they not every right to place their faith and their trust in the intellectual honesty of America, a country which had never broken a vow with another nation in either peace or war?

But what happened? Around the secret peace table at Yalta the noble principles in the Atlantic Charter were forgotten. The freedom-loving people of Poland were locked behind the iron curtain, where they remain today. Never was a greater travesty perpetrated upon the aspiration of any people. The events of those fateful hours at Yalta in the year 1945 constitute the blackest pages in the history of our Republic. For those misdeeds we today bow our heads in shame as we celebrate Poland's national holiday. We pray that in some manner we may atone for the wrongs committed on a people who placed their trust in our honor, who suffered incredible agonies in the belief that some day they would be free.

Today the Polish people stand conquered but not subdued. Their spirit is not crushed. That intense and unquenchable patriotism which they have never failed to manifest in their most tragic hours will live on to the day when they will again throw off the yoke of the oppressor and take their rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Poland, I salute you on this one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of your epoch-making constitution—the political and spiritual rebirth of a noble people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1951, we are privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty years ago, shortly after this great Nation gave birth to our present Constitution, Poland adopted a great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Here in this country we are cognizant of the tragedy, unparalleled in universal history, that the Polish Nation is going through. On this day we express our heartfelt sympathy and, at the same time, convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

If you can but imagine an enslaved America without the right to celebrate Independence Day on July 4, then you have some idea how the people of Poland feel today. Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for her to do so, but Poland cannot rejoice today. Soviet oppression will see to that; but even Communist enslavement and Russia's iron heel cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of this great day.

Today there is another Poland—a free Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. Yes, outside of the iron curtain this free Poland is just as strong, physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish nations in their fight to protect western civilization from being overrun by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

In passing, it is also just and fair to point out the contributions of many sons of Poland to this great Nation of ours, the United States of America. Yes; there was Pulaski, whose monuments and statues adorn many of our parks and public squares in this country. Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice for this country at Savannah, Ga. His contribution was truly symbolic of the Polish desire to fight freedom's battle anywhere on God's earth. There was Kosciuszko who, for a time, was adjutant to George Washington. His recommendations to build fortifications at West Point and, further, that a military academy be established there will always be a monument to his memory. The very names of Pulaski and Kosciuszko are "watchwords of liberty"; their contributions are indelibly written into the glorious record of American independence.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the valiant people of Poland look to this great Nation of ours for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States of America, a future observance of Polish Constitution Day will be one which the peoples of Poland can join in with all of the citizens of this great Nation who wish her well today.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] such time as he may require.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days when liberty is being challenged all over the world, and when liberty and freedom are dying all over

the world, it is only proper that we pause in our day's reflections and pay tribute to a people and a nation who have done so much to spread and encourage freedom world-wide. We all know in searching our history that when the Constitution of the United States was first launched not only to the people of America but was publicized throughout the world, there were those monarchs in Europe, Asia, and all over the world who laughed and scoffed at the Constitution of the United States. They said it would never work, that it was the work of madmen, that it was just something temporary, that it was something that would soon pass by. However, in this commemoration of Polish Constitution Day, the reason why we should pause in our reflections to pay tribute is that the first people and the first nation in all history that had confidence enough in the Constitution of the United States of America to emulate it was the country of Poland and the people of Poland. Something less than 3 years after the Constitution of the United States of America was adopted, here in a far away land, in a far away continent, a people and a country, the people of Poland and the Nation of Poland, were the first people and the first nation of the world to emulate the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Constitution Day of Poland that we commemorate today is commemorated because they were the first people and the first nation to pattern and model their constitution of freedom and liberty after that of the United States of America. That act, through the ages and since then, has been typical of the love and the fervor and the feeling of Poland for freedom and liberty.

We might come down to more modern times, for instance to the time of World War II. The patriotism and the love for freedom that the people of Poland showed is one that has no match in the annals of history of all mankind. Let us go back, for instance, to September of 1939, when all the world was shaking in its boots, afraid of that madman of Europe, when England got to the point when they sent their great statesman, Neville Chamberlain, over to Munich to meet Adolf Hitler.

Hitler said: "I am going to take this part of Czechoslovakia, I am going to take this part of another country, what are you going to do about it, Mr. Chamberlain?"

Mr. Chamberlain, shaking in his boots, said: "Mr. Hitler, I have my umbrella with me to protect you from the rain. You go ahead and take everything you want, just leave England alone. Let us alone."

Just as Chamberlain was shaking in his boots when he was meeting with Adolf Hitler and all of the rest of the world was trembling at the great force Hitler had assembled in Europe, there was one country and one people who said: "As for you, we care not what you do, but as for us we rather die for our freedom than to live under Nazi slavery."

And alone, with false promises from England, with false promises from France, the little country of Poland, which was not a warring nation, stood

up and fought; the first people in all the world with courage enough to stand up and say "No" to Adolf Hitler; the first people to stand up and tell Hitler: "You may take other parts of Europe but as for us, you are not going to take us without a fight."

They fought. For 19 days they stood up with bare bodies against the mightiest military machine the world has ever seen. At that time, you will remember, Adolf Hitler and Joe Stalin were pals. They made a pact. And on the 19th day of September, on the nineteenth day of the war, Hitler and Stalin made an agreement by which Joe Stalin started to march from the east, and Poland, a little country of some 32,000,000 people, was now wedged in between the two madmen of Europe, Joe Stalin on one side and Adolf Hitler on the other side. Still the 32,000,000 Poles did not give up. They fought for exactly 17 days longer. For 36 days Poland alone stood the onslaught of two of the mightiest military leaders and two of the worst and most brutal killers that the world has ever known.

Oh, yes, there are those cynics who say: "What does 36 days of resistance mean?" When you consider the fact that when Hitler started to march westward instead of eastward, he marched through Norway, through Belgium, through Denmark, through Luxembourg, through part of France and was ready to take England in 12 days, it gives you an idea of the bravery and the glory of the 32,000,000 Poles who stood alone. The aid that was promised never arrived. The 2,000 planes that England promised them never saw Polish soil because England did not have that many planes to give when they made the promise.

Did Poland give up? Not at all. In intrigues and escapades that will make some of the most romantic pages of our history if the truth were known these Poles that were now divided by the Russians and by the Germans skipped from one country to another and 6 months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish fliers were flying in the British Royal Air Force and they shot down 1 out of every 5 Nazi planes that were bombing London at that time. The only expeditionary force that the Allies sent to Norway after it was overrun by the Germans overnight was an expedition of impoverished Polish troops that were asked not to take a certain part of Norway. They not only achieved their mission but sent word to London that they needed more supplies and more men, saying that they would drive the Germans out of Norway. But, the only answer was, "Come back to England and save the British people." You will remember that was in the days of Dunkerque. Then they had them marching in the Normandy invasion; they had them marching in Italy and every place. The first defeat that Hitler suffered in Africa he suffered at the hands of a Polish regiment; a regiment of Polish people that skipped from the land of Poland from one country to another until they were regimented into a fighting force. Yes, the first defeat that the Germans suffered in Africa was suffered at the hands of a Polish contingent. And, that is not

all. Take the battle of Monte Cassino, where the Allies were driven back on four different occasions at a heavy loss of American lives. Finally, Gen. Mark Clark assigned troops to General Anders, and together they took Monte Cassino hill. They took it at a great cost of blood.

I remember very well the statement when General Anders went to General Clark in Italy. He said, "General, Poland wants to do its part in this fight for freedom. What can we do for you?" General Clark looked at General Anders, and he said, "General, you have not got any men. How can you fight the enemy?" General Anders looked at General Clark, and he said, "Oh, General, that is where you are wrong. I already have 25,000 Polish boys. You are different from me. You have your reinforcements behind you, General Clark, but I have got my reinforcements ahead of me, and every mile that we march through Italy my army is going to increase." And one by one the Polish boys joined the cause of the Allies. And the general of the Polish Army, General Anders, who started out with a contingent of 25,000 troops in Italy before the war was over had a contingent of 250,000 fighting Polish boys.

Poland has paid a price in this war that no nation has ever paid in the history of all mankind, 8,000,000 dead. Before the war Poland was a land of 32,000,000 people. After the war there were about 24,000,000 left. No people on earth ever paid so high a price for their liberty as did the people of Poland. And what was their reward? Three men going to Yalta, with more vodka in their bellies than brains in their heads, decided that these brave and gallant people shall receive their just reward. And their reward was betrayal by the United States; betrayal by England.

The master mind of that betrayal today sits in the Federal penitentiary. His name is Alger Hiss. He masterminded the betrayal of Poland. So today we find 24,000,000 Polish people living under Communist dictatorship because of the proficient work of a Communist agent working in a high place in the Government of the United States of America. His name is Alger Hiss. The monument that he has erected on behalf of his work is 24,000,000 people in Poland sold under the yoke of Communist slavery. The work of Alger Hiss is one that must be wiped off the history books of the United States of America. As long as the present policy in regard to Poland exists, every liberty-loving American must hang his head in shame until the wrong we have perpetrated against the people of Poland is corrected. We have no right to look for support from liberty-loving people all over the world until we do that. That is why today we find 90 percent of the people of the Slavic race under Communist yokes. They are under the Communist yoke because they look at the betrayal of Poland as an example of the word and honor of allies like Great Britain and the United States. So, in commemorating Polish Constitution Day, let us dedicate

our lives and our efforts to redeeming the great wrong that was perpetrated against a gallant and a great people. If we accomplish that and work in that direction, the world will love us, and freedom and honor once again will play the major part in the dealings of the United States of America with other people. Until that time comes I have grave concern for the future of this country and grave concern for the future of liberty and freedom everywhere.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this anniversary of the founding of the free Polish Government, I am privileged to address the House, in behalf of a nation and a people, who have greatly and immeasurably contributed to the development of free institutions in this world.

History is replete with the unexcelled sacrifices and evidence of devotion to the cause of liberty of the Polish people. I do not think there is any nation in the world, which has sacrificed more bitterly, more courageously, more unflinchingly than the Polish people.

In connection with my remarks, I desire to refer to a splendid letter recently received from an able advocate of the Polish cause, Mr. K. Stefan Pomierski, of Glen Cove, N. Y. I quote:

Let us pledge ourselves to the faith that says that the Yalta agreement shall be nullified forthwith, that the Polish-Government-in-exile and at present in London, shall receive immediate diplomatic recognition and that Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, hero of World War II, be appointed to the general staff of the armies of the Allies. If we do that we shall regain the full confidence of all freedom-loving peoples of the Americas, of Europe, and of Asia.

I believe sincerely that the foregoing brief sentences accurately reflect, not only the sentiments of Polish-Americans, but also the deep feeling of an overwhelming number of Americans of every class, creed, color, and station.

This historic day fills me at once with feelings of anguish and glory—the anguish of one whose heart goes out to the millions of poor souls in Poland, strong in the Christian faith, strong in their allegiance to democracy, who were betrayed in such a merciless, heartless manner at Yalta—glory because of the inspiration which lovers of democracy throughout the world have received from a people whose courage, fortitude, and unflinching spirit in the face of adversity, persecution and even death emphasize and exemplify the noblest qualities of the human soul.

Of course we must stand with the brave, gallant Polish Nation and its unsurpassed people. We must stand with them as they pass through the valley of the shadow of death into the new light of reborn freedom, which already appears on the horizon. We must stand with them in their struggles for independence and liberty, for tolerance, dignity, and justice, for the recapture of their free government and their rights as free men and women.

As I have said so many times, Poland is the test case of our intentions toward human freedom. If we do not come to the assistance of this suffering nation now, if we ruthlessly and mercilessly consign the Polish people to the unspeakable horror of oppression and tyranny, we will be failing to measure up in this generation to the great heritage of American freedom itself.

Let us solemnly resolve on this sacred occasion that not only our hearts, but our assurances of unfailing devotion, practical support, and assistance for their cause go out today from this great tribunal of democracy to the great and noble people of Poland. May the day of their liberation soon be at hand.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, the 3d of May, marks the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It is fitting that this great body pay tribute to the Polish people on this, their national holiday, even though the principles laid down in that constitution have gone temporarily into eclipse under the domination of a foreign power. I say temporarily, because the Polish Nation has been under oppression before in its history and has always emerged strong and resolute. The people of Poland are courageous people. That many of us know from our association with the Americans of Polish descent who have contributed so much to the building of this country.

We owe much to them, just as the whole Western World owes much to the Polish Nation which took the brunt of the brutal Nazi attack on that valiant country 12 years ago.

We owe much to the courage and determination of the Polish leaders who contributed to our own struggle for independence—Kosciusko, Sobieski, and Pulaski. Their contribution at the testing time for the infant American cause was incalculable. We owe much to Poland and to the people of Polish blood in our midst.

Today, 160 years after her first Constitution Day, Poland is again waiting for the chance to regain her independence. But commensurate with the bravery and spirit of her people, she is not waiting supinely. The underground which worked so effectively against the Nazi invaders is again carrying on. The flame of independent thought is being kept alive. Let us pay tribute to that unyielding spirit of independence and of unquenchable hope which keeps this flame alive, as we join with the thousands of free Poles all over the Western World who are observing this day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Members who spoke here today on their wonderful remarks in behalf of the people of Poland. That tragic sell-out of Poland by the United States and allies should be a lesson to us today that whenever we

surrender principle we have to buy it back in blood as we are now doing in Korea.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point, and have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 50 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion and considerable confusion existing in the minds of many Members of Congress concerning the need for the 16,000 beds which the President eliminated in his budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950.

In his recommendations for the curtailment of approximately 16,000 beds, President Truman asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. As a result of this request, the Administrator named 24 hospital projects to be canceled outright, and a reduction in the planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals.

It should be borne in mind that the President made this cancellation in the spring of 1949, when the veteran population had not reached its peak, and when there was no thought of a Korean conflict. Today's conditions alter the picture materially. In making his cancellation, the President said in his message:

I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for non-service-connected patients than at present.

That statement could not be made today. Unforeseeable circumstances have caused an overcrowding of Veterans' Administration hospitals to a point where good service to the disabled veteran is difficult and in some instances impossible to render. Especially is this so in the case of the neuropsychiatric and tuberculosis facilities, as I will point out later.

As of February 28, 1951, the latest figures which are available from the De-

partment of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, 147 hospitals were in operation, 18 of which were for tubercular patients, 34 for neuropsychiatric, and 95 were general medical and surgical hospitals. These facilities had a bed capacity of 108,035 patients and were occupied to the extent of 102,319 patients. This is approximately 95 percent of capacity. I am informed that civilian hospitals consider 80-percent capacity to be a safe margin for efficient operation and good service. In the case of our Veterans' Administration hospitals the percentage should be slightly higher, but not over 85 percent. Any increase over this 85 percent, I am told, is reflected in the well-being and treatment of the patients.

To consider the situation fairly, the types of hospitals should be weighed separately. At the present time, 50 percent of all veteran patients are in NP hospitals, 15 percent are in TB hospitals, and the remainder, 34 percent, are in the general medical and surgical hospitals.

The most serious congestion—and it is dangerous overcrowding—occurs in the NP hospitals, which bears, as you will note, over one-half of the entire patient load. There are several cogent reasons for this condition. There are operational difficulties in NP hospitals that are not present in other facilities. First, the patient turn-over is exceedingly slow, as you can realize; the nature of the disability makes long, tedious treatment necessary. Secondly, it is very difficult to staff these hospitals, both from the doctor and the nurse viewpoint. Professional men and women are loath to enter this phase of the profession and few of them stay with it permanently. This makes for a shortage of skilled professionals to service the patients.

Perhaps because I am more familiar with the conditions that exist in my home locality, I would like to cite the situation in the two NP hospitals that service the entire New England area. At Bedford, Mass., which is in my congressional district, is located an NP hospital which has a bed capacity of 1,803 patients. The hospital was planned and built for 1,636 beds, but the demand for hospitalization has become so urgent that space for an additional 167 patients has been made by using recreational and other available rooms for bed space. As of February 28, 1951, Bedford Hospital had a percentage of 100.6 patients in the facility. The manager of the hospital, Dr. Winthrop Adams, is one of the oldest in point of service and best known of the Veterans' Administration professional men. He is greatly respected for his ability and knowledge of his work. He is operating with a staff which is sadly undermanned both as to doctors and nurses. The taking away of recreational space and other rooms in order to make additional bed-space handicaps and prolongs the recovery of patients. In mental hospitals much better progress is made when the patient is contented and happy in his surroundings, and a reduction in recreational facilities is sharply reflected in the patients' progress toward recovery.

In the case of the NP hospital at Northampton, Mass., again we find that it

has a patient load running to 98.8 percent of capacity. This hospital was designed and built for 933 beds. At the present time 1,092 beds are occupied. The overload, here again is cared for by the addition of 172 beds in recreation rooms and other space originally not designed for hospital-bed uses.

Recently I received a protest from a committee appointed by the Franklin-Hampshire District No. 2, the American Legion, about the lack of facilities at Northampton Hospital. It was explained to me that the hospital load had been 100 percent full for the past 2 years. The larger number of these patients are veterans of World War I and World War II who have been hospitalized for several years. Incidentally, this hospital serves not only two-thirds of Massachusetts, but all of the States of Vermont, Connecticut, the western part of Rhode Island, Albany and Troy, N. Y. At the present time 50 percent of the bed patients are from the State of Connecticut, and the other 50 percent from various parts of New England. Also, right now there are 23 service-connected cases that are in the State hospital, their care being paid for by the Veterans' Administration. Four of these cases are not only mental but have tuberculosis. There are 168 non-service-connected cases on the waiting list at the present time. Sixty of these patients have been on the waiting list for 6 months. In the Northampton State Hospital, which is only approximately 4 miles from the Veterans' Hospital, there are 62 veteran patients now receiving treatment. Much resentment is being voiced by the families of these veterans, who feel their boys should be cared for in Veterans' Administration facilities.

As I said before, I point to the conditions in these two NP hospitals only because I am more conversant with the detailed facts in my own locality. However, a similar, and in some localities a worse, condition prevails. Just note the percentage of beds occupied in the neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Veterans' Administration listed below. The figures are as of February 28, 1951:

	Operating beds	Percent full
American Lake, Wash.	904	89.0
Augusta, Ga.	1,300	96.8
Bedford, Mass.	1,803	100.6
Canandaigua, N. Y.	1,700	96.7
Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116	100.3
Coatesville, Pa.	1,953	92.9
Danville, Ill.	1,717	99.8
Downey, Ill.	2,290	94.4
Fort Custer, Mich.	2,067	97.3
Fort Lyon, Colo.	853	96.6
Fort Meade, S. Dak.	720	94.0
Gulfport, Miss.	1,098	97.2
Knoxville, Iowa	1,631	98.0
Lebanon, Pa. (new addition)	652	92.8
Lexington, Ky.	1,216	96.1
Lyons, N. J.	2,013	98.1
Marion, Ind.	1,696	99.5
Montrose, N. Y. (new hospital)	1,349	81.1
Murfreesboro, Tenn.	1,307	94.5
Northampton, Mass.	1,105	98.8
North Little Rock, Ark.	2,095	95.8
Northport, N. Y.	2,502	95.0
Palo Alto, Calif.	1,443	96.4
Perry Point, Md.	1,910	96.8
Roanoke, Va.	2,000	94.6
Roseburg, Ore.	670	92.5
St. Cloud, Minn.	1,382	97.6
Sheridan, Wyo.	754	93.2
Togus, Maine	869	94.2
Tomb, Wis.	1,685	94.9
Topeka, Kans.	1,375	81.6

	Operating beds	Percent full
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	817	94.0
Tuskegee, Ala.	2,190	94.2
Waco, Tex.	2,040	96.2
Total neuropsychiatric beds.	50,793	95.5

It should be noted here, in considering the above table, that of the above total of 50,793 operating NP beds, 2,015 of these are emergency beds which, as I explained above, are beds placed in any space which can be made available and which was not designed primarily for operating beds. The percentage of capacity occupied—95.5 percent—is a dramatic figure when one considers the nature of the disability treated and the effect such overcrowding will have upon patients suffering from mental disabilities.

Conditions in tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration are little, if any, better. Here are figures on these hospitals:

	Operating beds	Percent full
Atlanta, Ga.	225	95.1
Excelsior Springs, Mo.	251	87.3
Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	222	87.4
Kerrville, Tex.	438	87.4
Livermore, Calif.	495	94.5
Memphis, Tenn.	300	92.0
Oteen, N. C.	1,500	89.8
Outwood, Ky.	316	96.2
Rutland Heights, Mass.	615	95.8
San Fernando, Calif.	441	95.9
Springfield, Mo.	477	88.7
Sunmount, N. Y.	383	94.8
Tucson, Ariz.	405	95.3
Walla Walla, Wash.	421	86.9
Waukesha, Wis.	256	85.5
Whipple, Ariz.	380	79.9
Total TB beds.	7,973	91.4

Here again, it should be recalled, that for safe, efficient operation a Veterans' Administration hospital should have no more than 85 percent of its beds occupied.

In the case of the general medical and surgical hospitals, the conditions are better, but not sufficiently so as to make the situation normal. There are a total of 49,269 operating beds, of which 86.5 percent are occupied.

That is the picture of the bed occupancy in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, according to the latest figures obtainable. What the situation will be when the disabled veterans from the Korean conflict flood into the Veterans' Administration facilities is one that gives much pause for thought. The time is not far off when the service hospitals will be turning these disabled veterans over to the Veterans' Administration for treatment and hospitalization. Already casualties in the Korean conflict have risen above the 50,000 mark so far as wounded are concerned. Thousands of these have been brought back to the United States and are being treated in the Army and Navy hospitals. These hospitals no longer will accept large blocks of disabled veterans from the overcrowded Veterans' Administration facilities. An example at hand is that of Walter Reed General Hospital here in Washington, which now has a regulation

permitting not more than 10 Veterans' Administration patients at any one time. A similar condition prevails at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, which at one time cared for several hundred Veterans' Administration patients.

The overcrowding, necessarily, has forced a large number of Veterans' Administration patients into civil and State hospitals. Hospitalization and treatment of these veterans is paid for by the Veterans' Administration. However, as everyone knows, our civil and State hospitals are inadequate for civilian needs and repeated requests have been received for relief from the care of these disabled veterans. It is particularly hard upon the disabled veterans, who would much rather receive treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility, and, as I noted in the case of the Northampton Veterans' Administration Hospital, the families of the veterans feel that their boys should be cared for by the Veterans' Administration.

At the end of February 1951 there were 4,209 disabled veterans being hospitalized in State and civil hospitals. There was a total of 3,502 veterans being cared for in other Federal hospitals. This adds up to 7,711 disabled veterans in outside hospitals. Of the number in State and civil hospitals, 1,630 were TB patients, 1,778 were NP cases, while 80 were general medical and surgical cases. This places a real burden upon the non-Veterans' Administration hospitals and in the cases of the NP and TB patients it is fair to point out that these are long-treatment patients, some of whom will require years of hospitalization.

There has been some criticism and inquiry over the classification of veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Because of the manner in which hospital records are kept by the Veterans' Administration, the present hospital load is divided at about 60 percent for non-service-connected veterans and 40 percent for service-connected veterans. However, there is one factor in this question of non-service-connected status that should be borne in mind. The average person looks at the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration showing that approximately 60 percent of the patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals are in the non-service-connected category and expresses astonishment. The fact is that there are many thousands of veterans in hospitals who are listed as non-service-connected but who also had a service-connected disability. They were admitted as non-service-connected cases because the major diagnosis was that of non-service-connected disability. Add to these cases the hundreds of others who are now rated as non-service-connected but will be designated as service-connected after complete adjudication of their claims, and the picture changes materially.

I believe it would be fitting at this point to insert a table showing veterans awaiting admission to hospitals as of February 28, 1951. It is an impressive list, and if conditions continue as they exist today, many of these disabled veterans will never receive the hospitalization they need so badly.

Veterans awaiting admission to hospital

	Total	Tuber- cular	Neuro- psychi- atric	General medical and surgical
AS OF 15TH OF MONTH				
1950—February	24,441	2,441	10,367	11,633
March	26,325	2,398	10,747	13,180
April	27,360	2,415	11,272	13,672
May	26,314	2,386	11,252	12,676
June	25,312	2,337	11,462	11,513
July	24,781	2,215	11,787	10,779
August	23,751	2,287	12,242	9,222
September	21,950	2,262	12,378	7,310
October	20,557	2,222	12,095	6,240
November	19,929	2,095	12,013	5,821
December	19,185	2,226	11,860	5,099
1951—January	19,306	2,069	11,753	5,484
February	20,821	2,346	11,852	6,623

There is a situation, however, that affects Veterans' Administration hospitals and their operation more seriously than any other factor. That is the alarming loss of professional and ancillary personnel through the draft and the recall of Reserves to the Armed Forces. From July 27, 1950, to the end of March 1951, the following professional employees of the Veterans' Administration have been lost to the Armed Forces:

	Number employed	Lost to Armed Forces
Staff physicians	3,986	136
Resident physicians	2,255	282
Nurses	13,640	434
Total	20,881	908

In the category of ancillary personnel—attendants, clerks, technicians, and so forth—1,571 employees have been lost to the Armed Forces. Replacements for all of these employees, and especially the professional, are difficult to get. As a result of competition from industry the Veterans' Administration is losing ward attendants at a rather alarming rate, particularly in NP and TB hospitals that are in areas where defense industries have begun to start up.

As you may recall, when the universal military training bill was before the House of Representatives an amendment was offered and adopted, that would exempt professional people of the Veterans' Administration from the draft and from recall to service. However, I am informed that when the bill came to conference this amendment was dropped, and any help from this quarter seems unlikely. About the only hope that I can see, at the present time, is the enactment of my bill, H. R. 2996, which would make these personnel a branch of the military forces of the United States. A similar plan was followed during World War II, and it worked successfully. I hope that it can be done again.

I have talked with a number of persons who are eminently qualified to know of the situation regarding the availability of doctors, nurses, and so forth, who would be necessary to man additional hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. Invariably the answer has been that there would be little difficulty in

finding the quantity and quality of professional men and women if the hospitals are not located in isolated localities.

In closing, I want to stress the great need for more hospitals for the Veterans' Administration, particularly in view of the tremendous potential bed load caused by the Korean conflict. Much of the need exists in TB and NP type facilities, where patient turn-over is slow and where the greater percentage of the cases are service-connected cases. We must not let these veterans down. It is an obligation we must face squarely and promptly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Charles A. Merrill appearing in the Boston Globe, April 29.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make today and include certain letters.

Mr. WITHROW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief editorial appearing in the April issue of Fortune magazine.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two letters and one newspaper article on the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam project on the Colorado River in Utah.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a clipping from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News, relative to CARE.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. THOMAS) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be \$389.50.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a recent address by Warren R. Austin, United States Representative to the United Nations.

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON] in Committee of the Whole today and include an article by Charles E. Jackson, general manager of the National Fisheries Institute.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 4, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

427. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

428. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the twenty-seventh quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period January 1 through March 31, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

429. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

430. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

431. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a request for authority to make grants for the development and improvement of certain class IV and larger airports as shown in the attached appended list, which projects are included in

the current revision of the national airport plan and, which should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to section 8 of the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2684. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2889. A bill to require the recordation of scrip, lien selection, and similar rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3795. A bill to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3955. A bill to permit the retention of oil, gas, and other mineral rights in lands condemned by the United States for waterway improvement purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3956. A bill to provide that the period of active service required of any person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be reduced by any period of active service which such person may have performed before such induction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3957. A bill to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3958. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to increase to 120 days the amount of leave which members of the Armed Forces may accumulate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3959. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3960. A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 221. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies in the conduct of hearings before committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUSHEY:

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for an investigation in open hearings of all circumstances relating to the action of the President in relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Becker Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Kurt Karl Otto Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Wladysla Bogusz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of George S. Paschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Marcella Maria Vankelsbick, nee Vanootegem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Franco Berardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of John (Hans-Christian) von Kotze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Esther Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Zhao Fong Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 21, expressing regret that General Douglas MacArthur was removed as supreme commander of the Far East, and a further reaffirmation of the resolution adopted at the last national convention of the American Legion calling for the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and also expressing regret that President Truman refused to meet with and have an audience with the national commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, following Cocke's world tour which included a visit with troops in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, resolution of the Rock County Dental Auxiliary, Rock County, Wis., reaffirming faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness: We thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary striving and confused thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of a new day. In the midst of daily toil and ever-pressing tasks, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts, grateful for the noontide pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer.

Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting

a proposed revision of a supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of \$13,000,000, for the Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal year 1951, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS' STORES, BALTIMORE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., on April 23, 1951, relative to improving conditions at the United States Appraisers Stores in Baltimore.

This is a matter of the utmost importance to the well-being of the great port of Baltimore, particularly at this time when traffic is moving through the port in near-record volume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 841. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 310); and

S. 1039. A bill to amend the provision of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the composition of boards for the recommendation of rear admirals of the Navy for continuation on the active list, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr. HUNT), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 312).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, Friday, May 4, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, or passed, as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Stavros S. Niarchos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which was considered and passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to